PATTERNS OF POWER

French Saint-Domingue

The Complete Study

1665 — 1804 — 1825

Thomas J. Bryan
with Claude (Anthropic)

Held as tested, not revealed.

CONTENTS

Preface and Outline PREFACE AND OUTLINE

Landscape I FIRM AND STABLE FOR EVER

Module 1 WITH ALL HIS TEETH

Module 2 ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHT PARTS

Module 3 ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO PITY THEM

Module 4 LAWS WITHOUT APPEAL

Module 5 MAGICAL PRACTICES, PROVEN AT TRIAL

Module 6 THE PLANTATION WITH NO CHILDREN

Module 7 THE DECREE THEY WERE HIDING

Module 8 RED POMPONS AND WHITE

Module 9 THE SIDE OPPOSITE

Module 10 A SINGLE MAN WHO HAS WORN THE EPAULETTE

Module 11 THE PRESENT INHABITANTS

Module 12 NOTHING TO RENT

PREFACE AND OUTLINE

Front matter · how this study was made, the disciplines it holds itself to, and a map of its thirteen parts

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The collaboration

This is a case study in the *Patterns of Power* series, applying the series' framework to the French colony of Saint-Domingue, from the buccaneers of Tortuga in the 1660s to the declaration of Haitian independence on 1 January 1804, with the French indemnity of 1825 as its coda. The framework is a lens for reading how any order of power is founded, dressed, and held: the floor of force beneath every order, the robe of doctrine laid over the floor to make the force cheap, the settlement that divides the spoils, the cost column in which each subject prices defection, the default by which an elite coordinates without instruction, and — running through all of it — position-logic, the proposition that rulers in like positions converge on like solutions because a position poses a problem with only a few good answers.

Saint-Domingue was chosen because it is the framework's limit case. Every other colonial study in this series found the coloniser sitting down on top of a former conquest that had already reached the self-running pole — a substrate he could rent, redirect, seize, or forge. **Saint-Domingue is the case where there was nothing there.** The prior conquest on this island did not naturalise; it exterminated. And so the French had to build the entire floor themselves, buy the population that stood on it, and hold the whole thing by force for a hundred years without a syllable of belief from the people beneath it. It is the purest expensive-pole order in the collection, and it is the only one whose ruled took a state and kept it.

The study was built the way the series is built, one module at a time. The author brought the framework, the direction, and the judgement of the whole, and held the

collaboration to its disciplines; Claude, Anthropic's model, did the research — verifying every load-bearing quotation, date, and figure by web search against a source reproducing the primary text before any module was written — and produced the drafts, applying the framework module by module, each presented and confirmed before the next was begun. The framework's concepts are the series'; the Saint-Domingue application, and the refinements it yielded, are the work of the collaboration.

Its engine throughout is the method of information asymmetry. The study exists to show the gap between what was said at the metropole and what was done in the colony, and it works by setting the exact public words beside the exact words of the ground — the *Encyclopédie*'s entry pricing a man in one volume beside its entry condemning the trade in another; the *Code Noir*'s articles forbidding torture beside a court acquitting the man who burned two women to death; the Declaration of the Rights of Man beside a sentence of the wheel that specifies which side of the square. It lays out the arithmetic and leaves the sum to the reader. It does not preach the conclusion.

Two premises the study began with were tested against the sources and **corrected**, and both corrections are on the page. The first, that the enslaved were deliberately mixed by origin to prevent solidarity: the intent is documented, but the result is false — two-thirds of them were still African-born at the end, because an order consuming its people faster than they are born cannot creolise them. The second, that the coloniser could not *see* the substrate the enslaved had built: he could see it, describe it, and legislate against it. What he could not do was *rent* it, because his own doctrine forbade him to recognise it as an order.

The disciplines

Five rules govern every module.

Quotation. Public-domain primary sources — edicts, ordinances, court sentences, constitutions, despatches, memoirs, the colonial press — are quoted exactly, at the length the argument needs, because in a legal fiction the precise wording *is* the evidence. Modern copyrighted scholarship is paraphrased, briefly, and credited.

No fabrication. No quotation, date, attribution, or figure is ever invented or reconstructed from memory. What cannot be verified is dropped or flagged, never

guessed; contested figures are given as ranges. This study carries an unusual number of flags, and they are deliberate: several of its most quotable lines survive only at one or two removes, and where that is so, it says so in the module's own note on sources rather than pretending to an authority it has not earned.

Gravity without partisanship. Suffering is held with gravity, and the study refuses both flattery and demonisation — it names the legal fiction as fiction and explains the order's logic without excusing it. Its recurring watchword is *legibility is not pardon*: to understand how a thing was done is not to forgive its being done. It applies this in both directions, and the reader should be warned. The planters of Saint-Domingue are read as ordinary men optimising against a price list, which is worse than reading them as monsters, not better. And the massacre of 1804 is counted in the same ledger as the century that produced it — not because the two weigh the same, but because a ledger that lets anybody's arithmetic close is not a ledger.

Contribution. Every module returns a refinement to the framework, stated plainly in its closing section, rather than merely applying the framework to the case.

Held as tested, not revealed. The pattern is treated as something discovered and tested against the evidence, not handed down as doctrine — a lens laid over the record, a tendency and never a law.

What Saint-Domingue added to the framework

Because this is the series' zero point — the conquest with no substrate — it was able to name features the other colonial cases could not. Chief among the refinements the study contributed: that **the recursion has two branches**, and a former conquest that exterminated rather than naturalised leaves a *vacancy*, and a vacancy cannot be rented; that a floor can be **bought rather than fought**, offshored to slavers and entered in the books as a cost of goods, and thereby made *recurrent* rather than founding; that the cheapest coercion available is the **co-optation of the hunted into the hunt**, which manufactures, over three generations, exactly the armed counter-elite that ends the order; that where a settlement's boundary is acquirable and enough of the excluded acquire it, the boundary **moves** onto something unacquirable, and a science is then built to survey it; that a robe with no audience among the ruled decays into a **decorative** one, and can be tested by publishing its refutation and seeing whether anything moves; that formation here was not withheld but **prohibited**, and that max-

imum extraction *destroys* formation-suppression by forcing bulk importation of the world it is erasing; that an order with no belief has no **channel**, and must therefore read its subjects by torture, and so **manufactures the conspiracies it fears**; that where the cost column carries the whole load, **the law cannot restrain the cost column**, and a slave code's humane articles are a robe for the metropole and not a restraint on the colony; that the fork between rate-extraction and dispossession requires a **third branch — extraction-as-consumption** — where the producer is himself the purchasable commodity, so that his death is not a loss but a purchase order, and the "just enough" equilibrium is severed not by cruelty but by a market; that a seam's failure mode is not exposure but **forgery**, because a century of withholding manufactures the credibility of any counterfeit that later arrives; that **no colonial administration can censor its own metropole**; that an apex may be bound by a threat rather than a code — the **default of fear** — which is perfectly reliable and wholly non-adjudicative; that **Divide-and-balance**, run here as the corpus's first full case, is the only Menu family requiring a live arbiter, and therefore the only one that fails not by corrosion but in an afternoon; that **Export relocates elite overproduction rather than discharging it**, and the terminus of the chain pays; that a core which cannot enforce **concedes in language**; that an excluded class turns the order's creed back **to the exact width of its own exclusion — and cannot hold it there**; and, largest of all, **the crack that stayed open**: that the ruled are never the proximate agent of the opening, but that where the opening is held open by forces they do not control for longer than an elite can re-form and shut it, the people armed in the opening *become* an elite, and can take and hold a state. The question was never whether they were capable of it. The question is how long the door stays open, and that is decided elsewhere.

The arc

A landscape opening and twelve modules, each with a framework function and its own evocative title.

Landscape — the two societies on the eve of conquest. **Firm and Stable For Ever.** Louis XIV's fiscal-military machine and an island emptied by an earlier conquest: the recursion failing, and a state that had to *buy* the floor it could not inherit.

1 — The Floor of Force. **With All His Teeth.** The *Encyclopédie*'s entry for *Pièce d'Inde*; a floor bought offshore, devolved to eight thousand proprietors, and hunted for by a *maréchaussée* manned entirely by free men of colour: the co-optation of the hunted into the hunt.

2 — The Settlement. **One Hundred and Twenty-Eight Parts.** Moreau de Saint-Méry's cadastral survey of blood, and the boundary that moved — from a status men could acquire in 1685 to a substance they could not in 1789.

3 — The Robe. **Almost Impossible to Pity Them.** Montesquieu's irony read straight; a robe cut for the metropole and not for the ruled, tested by the publication of its own complete refutation in the same *Encyclopédie* that priced the men — and surviving it, because nothing was resting on it.

4 — Formation. **Laws Without Appeal.** The Jesuits expelled in 1763 for teaching; a counter-substrate built in the dark — Vodou, Kreyòl, the maroon bands — which the coloniser could see, describe, and ban, but never rent.

5 — The Cost Column. **Magical Practices, Proven at Trial.** The royal prosecutor of the richest colony on earth certifying sorcery in evidence; Makandal burned; the Le Jeune affair; and the discovery that a floor with no channel to its subjects must read them by torture, and so invents its enemies.

6 — Extraction. **The Plantation With No Children.** An order whose output rose while its people fell; the third fork, where the producer is himself the commodity and his death is a purchase order; and the artery that this made into the order's throat.

7 — Information and Suppression. **The Decree They Were Hiding.** A seam three thousand miles wide; the Parlement of Paris burning Raynal and printing him in the judgment; and a rising, in 1791, of men enforcing a law that did not exist.

8 — Elite Coordination and the Default. **Red Pompons and White.** An apex bound by a ratio and not a creed; France's Divide-and-balance machine, which held for a century and shattered in an afternoon; and a governor who, losing his colonists, armed the caste they had spent sixty years insulting.

9 — Plurality or Foreclosure. **The Side Opposite.** Total foreclosure at the periphery under a sovereign becoming radically plural at its core; Vincent Ogé crossing an ocean to find a counterweight and coming home with a warrant and no bailiff; and a court that, sentencing him to the wheel, specified which side of the square.

10 — Change and Collapse. **A Single Man Who Has Worn the Epaulette.** France coming apart first, and Saint-Domingue not mentioned until it has; the cost column

emptying in June 1793 when a French commissioner opened the gates of Cap-Français; and the crack that stayed open long enough for the fuel to become the fire.

11 — The Grim Accounting. **The Present Inhabitants.** A century of consumption; a massacre ordered by a head of state and claimed by him in writing; a silence in the archive that is itself an item in the column; and the ordinance in which the King of France *conceded*, for a hundred and fifty million francs, an independence that had been taken from him at Vertières.

12 — Convergence and Divergence. **Nothing to Rent.** Saint-Domingue placed at the zero point of the substrate axis the corpus has been drawing without knowing it; and the strongest case against this whole reading — that the colony built the material world of the Enlightenment and the revolution left Haiti poor — stated at full strength and answered without flinching.

A note on sources. This front matter is descriptive and makes no primary-source claims of its own; every factual assertion about the case is established, with its sources and its flags, in the module it summarises. The framework it describes is the series'; the disciplines it lists are the ones the modules hold themselves to and document in their own closing notes. The reader who wishes to test this study should begin with those notes, which are written to make that testing possible — including where it would embarrass the argument.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*

FIRM AND STABLE FOR EVER

Landscape I · the order that built the colony — metropolitan France from the Fronde to Ryswick, an absolutist machine assembled out of its own civil war and running on war, set beside the emptied ground it reached for, where an earlier conquest had left it nothing to rule through

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The order that was built out of a civil war

The France that took the western third of Hispaniola was not the France of the Rights of Man, and the study will collapse into sentiment if that is forgotten at the outset. It was an absolutist monarchy that had just finished putting down a civil war among its own elite, and everything it did afterwards — including the acquisition of a distant coast it had never seen — is legible as the aftermath of that war. The Fronde ran from 1648 to 1653: a rebellion of *parlements* and then of princes, with a Bourbon of the blood, Condé, in arms against the crown and eventually in Spanish pay. The king was a child through it, driven from his capital, and he did not forget. Writing afterwards for his son, Louis XIV set the memory down as the founding grievance of his reign — the terrible agitations before and after his majority, a foreign war in which domestic troubles cost France a thousand advantages, a prince of his own blood and of a very great name at the head of his enemies. That sentence is the whole political programme of the next sixty years in compressed form, and every institution he built afterwards can be read as an answer to it.

The *Warlord's Dilemma* paper in this series names the position exactly, and it is worth naming here because it makes the founding of Saint-Domingue structurally legible rather than merely chronological. A ruler who emerges from a period of endemic elite violence and wishes to convert battlefield victory into durable order faces a short menu, and rulers as unconnected as Diocletian and Tokugawa Ieyasu

drew from it in the same way: build a standing armed force answerable to the centre and to no one else; put royal officials into the provinces in place of magnates; and construct a legitimating apparatus that makes obedience look like the shape of the world rather than the outcome of a recent fight. Louis XIV did all three. The standing army was the work of Michel Le Tellier, secretary of state for war from 1643 and the queen regent's principal adviser while Mazarin was in exile — a man who drew from the Fronde the plainest possible lesson, which the standard accounts state without embarrassment: that the army had to be taken out of the hands of the nobility and made wholly dependent on the king. It wore the king's uniform, it was commanded by his officers, and by the wars of the 1690s it was of a size no European state had previously attempted, its wartime strength conventionally given somewhere between three hundred and forty thousand and four hundred thousand men, though the paper strength and the men actually under arms were never the same number and the figure should be held loosely. The provinces went to the intendants. And the magnates went to Versailles.

The court is the co-optation machine, and the framework's engine — position logic — explains it without needing to attribute cunning to anyone in particular, though in this case the cunning is not really in doubt. A nobleman standing in an antechamber cannot raise a province; a nobleman competing for the honour of handing the king his shirt is not competing for anything else. The clearest testimony is from inside, from a duke who spent his life at that court and resented every hour of it. Saint-Simon records that the king looked to right and to left at his rising and his going to bed, at his meals, passing through the apartments, in his gardens at Versailles where only courtiers had the liberty to follow him; that he saw and noted everyone, that no one escaped him, down to those who did not even hope to be seen; and that he distinguished perfectly the absences of those always at court from those of the transients who came more or less often, weighed the general and particular causes of those absences, and lost no slight occasion of acting accordingly. It was a demerit not to make the court one's ordinary residence, a further demerit to come rarely, and certain disgrace never to come at all — and when something was wanted for such a man, the king would answer proudly, *«Je ne le connais point»*, I do not know him; and of those who appeared seldom, *«C'est un homme que je ne vois jamais»*, he is a man I never see. Nothing more was required. A great house could be ruined by a sentence, and the sentence cost the crown nothing.

Hold the irony, because the study's architecture depends on it: the order that founded the colony was itself the product of an elite fracture, and it would one day be destroyed by another. Landscape II, which opens Module 10, will find the same machine coming apart. The thread that runs between the two is not moral. It is fiscal.

The machine that had to be fed

Absolutism of this kind is expensive, and the expense is not incidental to the colony — it is the reason for it. Jean-Baptiste Colbert became controller-general of finances in 1665 and secretary of state for the navy in 1669, and the system he ran, which posterity named after him, was not primarily an economic theory but a way of paying for war. Colonies existed to enrich the state; cash crops came out, manufactures went in; colonial trade was bound to the metropole alone under the arrangement the eighteenth century would call the *exclusif*, and which the planters of Saint-Domingue would spend a century resenting. The navy, which had held perhaps twenty-five vessels when the personal reign began in 1661, was rebuilt to something like a hundred and forty-four by 1677, with new arsenals, new schools of hydrography and marine engineering, and a rotary conscription of seamen. All of it cost money, and money came from trade, and trade meant islands.

The instrument was chartered by royal edict on 28 May 1664: the Compagnie française des Indes occidentales, capitalised at six million livres, with the king himself holding the majority of the shares, granted for forty years the property of the French possessions on the Atlantic coasts of Africa and America and the monopoly of trade with them. It was not a success. It could not supply the islands, could not stop the Dutch, and was disliked by the very colonists it was meant to enrich. In December 1674, by an edict signed at Saint-Germain-en-Laye, the king revoked it — and the wording of that revocation is the plainest statement in the whole founding of what a colony was for. Having revoked, extinguished, and suppressed the company established by his edict of May 1664, the king resolved *«de remettre en nos mains et réunir à notre domaine»* — to take back into his own hands, and reunite to his domain, all the lands he had conceded to it, together with the seigneurial and capitation dues and the other rights levied to its profit. The colony did not become a province of France. It became the king's own estate, held directly, and its purpose was to yield.

What the yield was for can be measured, and the measurement is grim on both sides of the ocean. The Nine Years' War, which ran from 1688 to 1697, was financially crippling to every state that fought it; European armies had grown from an average of around twenty-five thousand men in 1648 to over a hundred thousand by its close, a scale no pre-industrial economy could carry. And in the middle of it, in the winter of 1693–94, France starved. The harvest of 1693 failed after a run of cold wet seasons, bread reached a price a Paris labourer could not meet with a day's wage, and the excess mortality of those two years is put by Le Roy Ladurie at around 1.3 million in a kingdom of some twenty million, with other reckonings running as high as 1.6 to 2 million and Lachiver counting 2,836,000 deaths against 1,325,000 births across the two years — figures contested in their detail, agreed in their order of magnitude, and comparable, as French historians have not shrunk from saying, to the losses of the First World War in a country half the size and in a quarter of the time.

Into that winter an anonymous letter was written to the king by François Fénelon, then tutor to the king's grandson and soon to be archbishop of Cambrai. Its indictment is exact, and it is the primary text that ties this landscape to the one that opens Module 10: *«Cependant vos peuples, que vous devriez aimer comme vos enfants, et qui ont été jusqu'ici si passionnés pour vous, meurent de faim. La culture des terres est presque abandonnée ; les villes et les campagnes se dépeuplent ; tous les métiers languissent et ne nourrissent plus les ouvriers. Tout commerce est anéanti. Par conséquent vous avez détruit la moitié des forces réelles du dedans de votre État, pour faire et pour défendre de vaines conquêtes au dehors. [...] La France entière n'est plus qu'un grand hôpital désolé et sans provision.»* Your peoples, whom you ought to love as your children, and who until now have been so passionate for you, are dying of hunger. Tillage is all but abandoned; the towns and the countryside are emptying; every trade languishes and no longer feeds its workmen. All commerce is annihilated. You have therefore destroyed half the real strength within your own state, in order to make and to defend vain conquests abroad. All France is now no more than one great desolate hospital, without provisions.

The letter was very probably never read by the man it was addressed to, and it was not printed until 1787. Note the date and set it aside; it will be waiting in Landscape II.

The ground that kept nothing

Every colonial study in this collection has so far confirmed one of the framework's harder disciplines: that a conqueror never meets an aboriginal or timeless baseline, only an earlier conquest so thoroughly naturalised that the conquered experience it as simply the world. The Islam that France met in Algeria in 1830 was the seventh-century Arab conquest naturalised across a millennium. The Confucian order France met in Vietnam in 1858 was the Han conquest naturalised, reproduced by the Vietnamese as their own civilisation, and running on the conviction of the governed. Buganda's sacred kingship was likewise a build that had taken. In each case the coloniser found a self-running order beneath him and could rent it — its formation, its administration, its legitimacy — which is precisely why those conquests were thin and cheap.

Hispaniola is where that expectation breaks, and the break is the spine of this study. The prior conquest there had not naturalised. It had annihilated.

The Taíno numbers are among the most violently contested in the demographic literature and must be given as ranges rather than figures: estimates of the population of Hispaniola in 1492 run from around a hundred thousand at the low technical end, through the three to four hundred thousand favoured by a good many modern scholars, to a million and beyond, with early Spanish observers claiming three or four million and being generally disbelieved. What is not contested is the shape of the curve. By 1508 the standard reckoning is around sixty thousand; the repartimiento count of 1514 gives something in the region of twenty-six to thirty-two thousand; the smallpox epidemic of 1518–19 carried off a large share of those who remained; and by the middle of the century the enumerated survivors are counted in the hundreds. Enslavement in the mines, the disruption of the food economy, the collapse of the birth rate, and the epidemics ran together, and the historiography has spent decades arguing over which floor the body fell from. Honesty requires two further notes. Descendants survived, mixed into the population, and the eventual official declaration of extinction is at least partly an artefact of colonial classification rather than a simple demographic fact. And what matters for the framework is not extinction as a biological event but extinction as a *structural* one: no Taíno order survived — no priesthood, no chiefly hierarchy, no calendar, no law, nothing self-running, nothing that a later conqueror could stand behind and point at himself. There was no substrate left to rent.

Then the ground was emptied a second time, and the second emptying was deliberate, dated, and done by the Spanish crown to its own subjects. The northern and western settlements of Hispaniola — Puerto Plata, Monte Cristi, Bayajá, La Yaguana — had been trading their hides and cured meat with French, English, and Dutch smugglers since the middle of the sixteenth century, and Madrid could not stop it. So Madrid removed the coast. A royal cédula of 1603 ordered the towns depopulated and their people resettled inland, and between 1605 and 1606 the governor, Antonio de Osorio, carried it out — with troops, when the inhabitants refused to go. The soldiers burned the sugar works, the huts, the ranches, the haciendas and the churches, and destroyed whatever a person would need to live in those places. The survivors were marched to two new inland towns, Monte Plata and Bayaguana, and more than half of them are reckoned to have died of hunger or disease. Something over a hundred thousand head of cattle, pigs, and horses were abandoned, only a small fraction of them driven inland with their owners.

The devastations did not stop the smuggling. They made everything the crown had feared not merely possible but inevitable: an emptied coast with no Spanish presence on it, and, running loose across that coast, a hundred thousand head of livestock that had gone wild and were breeding.

The men who laid the floor

Men came for the cattle. They were French for the most part, though not only, and they hunted feral cattle for the hides and feral pigs for the meat, which they smoked slowly on a wooden frame over a low fire. The frame was a *boucan*, and the men were *boucaniers* — and the word *boucan* is a loan from the Arawakan language of the island's dead, taken up by the Spanish, passed to the French, and anglicised at last into *buccaneer*. It deserves a moment, because it is the exact figure of the recursion failing: the only thing the earlier conquest left the later one to inherit was a word for smoking meat.

These men are the subject of *Above Warlordism* in the most literal sense the collection has yet encountered — not a metaphor for warlordism but the article itself. They were armed, they were organised enough to fight, they held ground, they lived off it, they answered to no sovereign, and from about 1640 they called themselves the Brethren of the Coast. They fortified Tortuga, the island off the north-west coast,

where in the early 1640s the engineer Le Vasseur built a fort said to have mounted more than forty guns. They sold their hides and their smoked meat to whoever would buy, they raided the Spanish when raiding paid better than hunting, and the Spanish, who understood perfectly well what was happening, tried repeatedly to exterminate both the men and the animals they lived on, and failed.

The French state did not conquer this coast. It arrived afterwards and bought the men who had. Tortuga passed to the Compagnie des Indes occidentales in 1664, and in June 1665 the company's governor landed: Bertrand d'Ogeron, a former captain of the marine regiment who had himself lived among the buccaneers at Petit-Goâve and planted tobacco at Léogâne. His first act was a census, which found a few hundred free whites, a few dozen slaves, and some indentured servants; his report to Colbert described seven or eight hundred Frenchmen scattered along the coasts of Hispaniola in inaccessible places among mountains and rocks, and asked for the authority and the means to bring them in. What followed over the next decade was not a conquest but a conversion. D'Ogeron gave them tobacco and land and shipped in women and the beginnings of a parish structure; he issued privateering commissions to the ones who would not settle, which converted their violence from freelance into royal; and by the time he was replaced in 1675 a considerable share of the freebooters had become planters. The last of them were disposed of by the same method twenty years later, from the other end: after the Treaty of Ratisbon of 1684 the governor Tarin de Cussy took buccaneers into royal service and used them to suppress their former companions, and at the century's close Ducasse persuaded the remainder to settle. The floor was not laid by the state. It was laid by warlords, and the state's first act of sovereignty over it was to make them gentlemen.

The year the state sorted its human material

Then, in a single year, the machinery of the metropole reached across the ocean and defined, in law, who the people on that coast were going to be.

In March 1685, at Versailles, Louis XIV issued the edict for the government and administration of justice and the police of the French islands of America and for the discipline and commerce of the enslaved — the text the eighteenth century learned to call the *Code Noir*. It was drawn in the highest of the chancery's forms: great letters patent, addressed «*À tous, présents et à venir, SALUT*», to all present and to come. Its

first article expelled the Jews from the islands. Its third forbade the public exercise of any religion but the Roman Catholic. Its second required that every enslaved person in the islands be baptised and instructed in that faith. Its thirty-eighth prescribed, for a slave a month in flight, the cutting off of the ears and a fleur-de-lys branded on one shoulder; for a second month, the hamstring cut and the other shoulder branded; and for the third offence, death. Its forty-second permitted a master to chain and to beat with rods or cords, and forbade him torture and mutilation. Its fifty-ninth granted to the freed the same rights, privileges and immunities as persons born free. And its forty-fourth declared, in seven words that are the founding legal fiction of the colony, *«Déclarons les esclaves être meubles»* — we declare the enslaved to be movable goods, entering the marital community of property, divided equally among coheirs, exempt from dower and feudal claims, handled at seizure by the forms prescribed for movable things.

The signature reads *LOUIS*, and beneath it *«Par le Roi, COLBERT»* — but Jean-Baptiste Colbert had been dead two years by then, and the hand is his son's, the marquis de Seignelay, who had inherited the navy and the colonies along with the name. The visa reads *LE TELLIER*: Michel Le Tellier, the architect of the standing army, now chancellor of France. And the closing formula is the ordinary one, which is why it is worth reading slowly: *«afin que ce soit chose ferme et stable à toujours, nous y avons fait mettre notre Scel»* — that it may be a thing firm and stable for ever, we have caused our Seal to be set upon it — *«et scellé du Grand Sceau de Cire verte en lacs de Soie verte et rouge»*, sealed with the Great Seal in green wax on laces of green and red silk. Under the conventions the French chancery had kept since the fourteenth century, green wax on silk was the form reserved for acts of perpetual effect; yellow wax was for the temporary. The declaration that a human being was furniture was sealed in the wax the kingdom used for what it meant to last for ever.

It was not the only edict of that year. In August 1685 a further edict established a Conseil Souverain and four royal courts on the coast of Saint-Domingue: the pirate shore was given a supreme court. And in October, at Fontainebleau, Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes — abolishing the legal existence of French Protestantism, ordering the temples pulled down, the schools closed, the pastors out of the kingdom within fifteen days, and the laity forbidden to follow them. Michel Le Tellier signed it too, in the first days of October, and died at the end of that month, having, it was said, sung the *Nunc dimittis — now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace* — before

he went. The same hand, the same great seal, the same green wax, in the space of seven months, sealed the enslaved of the Antilles into the category of movable property and sealed the Huguenots out of the national community altogether. The *Code Noir* was itself registered at Saint-Domingue by the new Conseil Souverain, sitting at Petit-Goâve, on 6 May 1687.

The treaty that ratified what it did not name

The colony is usually dated from the Peace of Ryswick, signed in September 1697, on the ground that Spain there ceded to France the western third of Hispaniola. The record is more interesting than that, and more useful. The treaty text does not name Hispaniola; Spain appears deliberately to have avoided naming it; no boundary was drawn; and a strand of Dominican historiography going back at least to Rodríguez Demorizi has argued that the "formal cession" is a nineteenth-century misconception read backwards into a document that does not contain it. What is agreed is that Spain, having concluded that the French could no longer be removed, stopped trying to remove them. The line between the two colonies was not actually fixed until the Treaty of Aranjuez of 3 June 1777, eighty years later — and it was then drawn, in the words of a nineteenth-century American summary of the record, substantially at the edge of the French settlements.

That is the corpus's pattern in one sentence. The treaty did not create the floor. It ratified a floor already laid by armed men, and when at last a line was drawn on the map, it was drawn where the guns already stood.

Reading the landscape against the framework

The landscape confirms the framework's colonial predictions in their setup and returns three refinements to be carried into the modules.

The recursion has two branches, and the collection has only been reading one of them. The principle as stated is that a conqueror never meets an aboriginal baseline but always an earlier conquest naturalised — and Algeria, Vietnam, and Buganda all confirmed it, because in each the earlier conquest had reached the cheap self-running pole and could therefore be borrowed. Hispaniola supplies the other outcome, and it must be added to the framework as a named alternative rather than

treated as a strange exception. **A prior conquest can naturalise, or it can exterminate.** Where it naturalised, the next conqueror inherits a formed order he can rule through: a clergy, a chiefly hierarchy, a calendar, a body of trusted interpreters, a population already formed to obey somebody. Where it exterminated, he inherits a vacancy — and a vacancy cannot be rented. He must supply the entire floor himself, out of his own pocket, in every generation, for as long as he means to hold the ground. That single structural fact is this study's central prediction, and everything extreme about Saint-Domingue is downstream of it: the most savage coercive apparatus in the collection, an extraction that consumed its own labour force, a robe that never took with anyone it ruled, and the most explosive collapse in the corpus. The prediction is now on the page, and Modules 1 through 7 will test it.

A floor can be adopted rather than laid, and the state's first act of sovereignty can be a purchase. *Above Warlordism* argues that complex orders climb above the warlord; Saint-Domingue is the case where that climb is documented step by step and can be dated. Freelance armed men took the ground; the crown arrived afterwards and legalised, pensioned, commissioned, and titled them, converting a piratical floor into a plantation floor without a conquest ever being fought. The refinement to carry forward is that this leaves a *residue in the elite's self-understanding*: a planter class whose founding memory is not that the king gave it the land but that it took the land and the king came out afterwards to bless the taking. That is a fault line, and Module 8 is where it will be looked for.

And the revealed-preference test, applied at the founding, already gives its answer. The framework's sharpest diagnostic holds that where an apex pays a real, avoidable cost to legitimate itself to some population, that expenditure proves the population's belief was needed — and that where it secures force and spends nothing further, the absence is equally a finding. Look, then, at what the *Code Noir* actually spends on. It pays Rome (baptism, instruction, the Catholic monopoly, the Sunday rest); it pays the metropolitan conscience (the master may not torture or mutilate; the freed enjoy the rights of the free-born); it pays the planters (the enslaved are movable property, seizable, divisible, inheritable). It spends nothing whatever on persuading the enslaved that any of this is right — because it does not need to, and does not intend to. There is no robe cut for the people the colony exists to consume. At the very founding, before a single sugar mill turned, the order had already decided to hold

its labouring majority entirely by the floor. Surveillance is the tell of a belief that never took; here is the rarer and colder thing, an order that never attempted the belief at all.

Legibility is not pardon. The point of setting out the machinery this way is not to make the *Code Noir* reasonable — it is not, and the fiction at its centre, that a person can be a *meuble*, is named here as a fiction and will be named as one throughout. The point is that the machinery is intelligible, that it was built by men in a position that made it look like good administration, and that the same absolutist state which had learned from its own civil war how to disarm a nobility, garrison a province, and buy a warlord could apply that competence across an ocean without any of the men involved feeling that they had done anything unusual. That is the wound the collection exists to keep in view: the apparatus that lifts a society above the warlord is the same apparatus that, turned outward, commits harm at a scale no warlord could reach.

One last thread, and it is the one that runs to Module 10. The colony was created by a fiscal-military machine, to pay for wars. Those wars, and the wars of the king's successors — above all the ruinous financing of the American revolt against Britain — produced the debt that in 1789 forced the crown to summon the Estates-General, where the elite fractured. Fénelon wrote in 1694 that all France was one great desolate hospital without provisions. That letter was not printed until 1787. The machine's bill came due at both ends of the same century, and the colony was created by the machine and destroyed by its bankruptcy.

A note on sources. The primary quotations here are given exactly, from sources reproducing the texts, and are public-domain. The *Code Noir* — the edict of March 1685, its preamble addressed *«À tous, présents et à venir, SALUT»*, articles 1, 2, 3, 38, 42, 44 and 59, the signature *«Par le Roi, COLBERT»* with the visa *LE TELLIER*, the sealing clause *«afin que ce soit chose ferme et stable à toujours… scellé du Grand Sceau de Cire verte en lacs de Soie verte et rouge»*, and the registration at the Conseil Souverain of Saint-Domingue at Petit-Goâve on 6 May 1687 — is quoted from the full text published by the Fondation pour la mémoire de l'esclavage and cross-checked against the Wikisource transcription of the 1685 edition and the BnF's reproduction. The August 1685 edict establishing a Conseil Souverain and four royal seats on the coast of Saint-Domingue is attested on the title page of the eighteenth-century printed editions of the *Code Noir* (Veuve Saugrain, Paris, 1718). The December 1674 edict revoking the Compagnie des Indes occidentales and reuniting its lands to the royal domain (*«de remettre en nos mains et réunir à notre domaine»*) is quoted from a reproduction of the edict's text. Fénelon's *Lettre à Louis XIV*, written anonymously in the winter of

1693–94 and not printed until 1787, is quoted from reproductions of the letter; the attribution of its first publication is given here only as a date, since accounts of the circumstances differ. Saint-Simon's account of the court is quoted from a reproduction of the *Mémoires*. The Edict of Fontainebleau of October 1685 is described from the text and from the standard accounts. Louis XIV's remark on the Fronde is drawn from the *Mémoires pour l'instruction du Dauphin* as reproduced in the quotation literature and is therefore paraphrased rather than quoted here, pending verification against the Dreyss edition.

Modern scholarship is paraphrased and credited. The Taíno demographic figures are the most contested in this landscape and are given as ranges: contact estimates from roughly 100,000 to over 1,000,000 (the historiographical dispute is surveyed in Massimo Livi Bacci, "Return to Hispaniola: Reassessing a Demographic Catastrophe," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 2003); c. 60,000 by 1508; c. 26,000–32,000 at the repartimiento of 1514; hundreds by mid-century. The caution that the eventual declaration of extinction is partly an artefact of colonial classification, and that descendants survived, is taken from the current literature and stated in the text. The Devastations of Osorio (royal cédula of 1603; carried out 1605–06; Puerto Plata, Monte Cristi, Bayajá and La Yaguana destroyed; resettlement at Monte Plata and Bayaguana; over 100,000 head of livestock abandoned; more than half the resettled dead) follow the Dominican and standard accounts. The buccaneer sequence — Tortuga from about 1630, Le Vasseur's fort of the early 1640s, the Brethren of the Coast from about 1640, the sale of Tortuga to the Compagnie in 1664, d'Ogeron's governorship from June 1665 and his report to Colbert of seven or eight hundred Frenchmen on the coasts of Hispaniola, the conversion to tobacco and settlement, the Treaty of Ratisbon of 1684, Tarin de Cussy's enlistment of buccaneers against their former companions, and Ducasse's settlement of the remainder — follows the standard scholarship and the period accounts (Exquemelin, 1678; Charlevoix, 1730–31), with d'Ogeron's report given in English paraphrase because the wording available to this study is itself a translation. Figures for the French army (a wartime strength conventionally given at 340,000–400,000) and navy (c. 25 vessels in 1661, c. 144 by 1677) are given as the standard accounts give them, with the caveat stated in the text that paper strength and effectives diverged. The famine mortality of 1693–94 is given as a range (excess mortality c. 1.3 million on Le Roy Ladurie's estimate; up to 1.6–2 million on others; Lachiver's count of 2,836,000 deaths against 1,325,000 births across the two years), and that of 1709–10 at roughly 600,000–650,000. On Ryswick, the standard account (Spain ceded or recognised French control of Tortuga and western Hispaniola) is stated alongside the specialist objection that the treaty text does not name the island and that the "formal cession" is a later construction — an objection associated with Emilio Rodríguez Demorizi, "Acerca del Tratado de Ryswick," *Clío*, 1954 — and with the fact that no boundary existed until the Treaty of Aranjuez of 3 June 1777. The scholarly reading of the *Code Noir* as a seventeenth-century juridical text rather than a monstrosity *sui generis* (Jean-François Niort and others) is noted and held open; this study's disagreement with it is structural, not moral, and is stated in the closing section. The lasting figures of the colony —

populations, imports, mortality, output — belong to Modules 2, 5, 6 and 11 and are not asserted here.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*

WITH ALL HIS TEETH

Module 1 · The Floor of Force — a conquest performed on another continent and bought; a floor devolved to the property-owner and distributed one whip to a gang; and a hunting apparatus assembled, at every level, out of men the order had beaten and then hired

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The conquest that happened somewhere else

The framework's first module asks who held organised violence at the founding, by what act the order was established, and against whom. Applied to Saint-Domingue the question does not resolve, and the failure to resolve is the finding. There was no founding conquest of the people who would be ruled, because at the founding those people were not there. They were in Kongo, in Angola, in the Bight of Benin, in the Bight of Biafra, in Senegambia, and in the interiors behind those coasts, and they were made subjects of the French crown by being captured, marched, sold, chained, and shipped. The conquest that produced the population of Saint-Domingue was performed on another continent, by other hands — by African polities and raiders and brokers, and by European factors — and the French colonial state did not carry it out. It bought its subjects, already defeated, at a price.

The colony's most exact founding document is therefore not a treaty or a battle report but a definition, and it is to be found in the great compendium of the European Enlightenment. Under the heading *Commerce*, the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and d'Alembert explains the term of art: *«Piece d'inde, (Comm.) terme usité dans le commerce de la traite des negres, où l'on appelle negre piece d'inde, un homme ou une femme depuis quinze jusqu'à vingt-cinq ou trente ans au plus, qui est sain, bien fait, point boiteux & avec toutes ses dents.»* A piece of the Indies, a term used in the trade in negroes, where one calls a negro a *piece of the Indies* — a man or a woman from fifteen

up to twenty-five or thirty years at most, who is sound, well made, not lame, and with all his teeth.

Read the sentence as the framework requires it to be read, which is not as an atrocity but as an instrument. It is a unit of account. Its function is to make human beings commensurable, so that a cargo can be tallied, a tariff assessed, a contract written, and an insurance premium calculated. A person outside those ages, or lame, or missing teeth, was entered as a fraction. This is the arithmetic on which the floor of Saint-Domingue rested, and it was set down without embarrassment in the same volumes that taught Europe about optics and canal locks. The *Code Noir* of 1685 declared the enslaved to be *meubles* — the legal fiction. The *Encyclopédie* supplies the accounting fiction beneath it, and the two together are the whole apparatus by which a person became a thing that could be counted.

The counting can be given, with the caution that all these figures are contested and must be held as ranges. In 1681 the enslaved population of the French establishments in western Hispaniola was of the order of two thousand. By 1789 it stood somewhere between about 465,000 and 500,000, against roughly 28,000 to 40,000 whites and roughly 22,000 to 30,000 free people of colour — the official census of 1788 returning 27,717 whites, 21,808 free people of colour, and 405,464 enslaved, a total generally thought to undercount the enslaved. Between 1681 and 1791 the number of Africans landed in the colony is put at something between 790,000 and 900,000, and in the last years before the rising, Saint-Domingue was absorbing on the order of a third of the entire Atlantic slave trade, with annual arrivals in the peak years variously given between twenty and forty thousand.

Set the two numbers side by side and the central fact of this colony emerges before any module has argued for it. Somewhere approaching eight hundred thousand people were landed. Fewer than five hundred thousand were alive when the trade stopped. The difference is not emigration.

That will be Module 6's arithmetic. What Module 1 must take from it is structural: **the floor of Saint-Domingue was not a founding act but a standing purchase.** It did not defeat a people once and then hold them. It bought people continuously, because the people it bought died, and it had to buy more. The founding violence was therefore not merely offshore but *recurrent* — an annual, budgeted, insured, advertised violence, done at a distance by parties the French state could disown, and

entered in the ledgers of Nantes and Bordeaux and La Rochelle not as conquest but as cost of goods.

The garrison in every field

A conventional colonial floor is a garrison: soldiers, fortresses, a weapons monopoly, and the mechanics of capturability that make dispersal impossible. Saint-Domingue had soldiers — two colonial regiments, one at Cap-Français and one at Port-au-Prince — and it had forts and a naval station. But these are not where the floor lived. The regular troops were quartered in the towns; the administrators of the eighteenth century complained that they were of little use for the countryside; and it is not credible in any case that a few thousand European soldiers, sickening and dying of fever, held down half a million people across an area of mountain, plain, and forest.

The floor lived in the fields, and it was privatised. By 1789 the colony carried something in the order of eight thousand plantations, and each of them was a garrison. The instrument was the *atelier*, the field gang, and the officer of the atelier was the *commandeur*, the driver — himself, in the ordinary case, an enslaved man, chosen for capability and set over his fellows with a whip. A French officer of engineers named Justin Girod-Chantrans, who served in the colony during the American war and published his account in 1785, set the scene down without ornament: «*Il n'est pas d'animaux domestiques dont on exige autant de travail et dont on a si peu soin... Des malheureux aux trois quarts nus et qui versaient toutes les sueurs de leurs corps pour satisfaire à leur devoir. J'apercevais parmi ces Noirs, un maître commandeur qui, armé d'un grand fouet, imposait par la crainte aux hommes et aux femmes qu'il surveillait d'un œil sévère.*» There is no domestic animal of which so much work is demanded and of which so little care is taken. Wretches three-quarters naked, pouring out every sweat of their bodies to satisfy their duty; and among these blacks I perceived a master-driver who, armed with a great whip, imposed by fear upon the men and women he watched with a severe eye.

The law had already stripped the person of the means to resist. Article 15 of the *Code Noir* forbade the enslaved to carry any offensive weapon or even a heavy stick, on pain of the whip and confiscation, excepting only those sent hunting by their masters and carrying a written pass or a known mark. Article 16 forbade the enslaved of different masters to assemble by day or by night, under pretext of a wedding or

otherwise, on pain of corporal punishment that could not be less than the whip and the fleur-de-lys brand, and — on repetition or aggravating circumstance — of death at the judge's discretion; and the same article enjoined *all* the king's subjects to run down offenders and arrest them, whether they held any office or not. A weapons monopoly enforced upon the individual body; a prohibition on assembly enforced by every free person in the colony as a standing duty. That is the whole architecture of capturability, and it did not need a garrison.

And Article 42 completed it by licensing the private violence of the owner: masters might, when they judged their slaves to have deserved it, have them chained and beaten with rods or cords; they were forbidden torture and mutilation, on pain of confiscation of the slave and extraordinary proceedings against themselves; and Article 43 enjoined the king's officers to prosecute criminally any master or driver who killed a slave in his power. Take those two articles at their word and the colony had a code restraining its masters. Take them against the record and the restraint is thin: prosecutions were rare and convictions rarer, the colonial courts sat among the planters, and the scholarship — including the scholarship most careful to insist that the *Code Noir* be read as an ordinary seventeenth-century juridical text and not a monstrosity apart — agrees that the protective clauses were the ones most widely ignored, because the men who would have had to enforce them were the men against whom they ran.

Here is the framework's ledger made visible. The floor is the cost column; the robe keeps the benefit column high so that the floor need seldom be used. Saint-Domingue had no robe for the ruled at all, so the cost column had to carry the entire weight — and the state, which could not possibly have paid for a coercive apparatus of that size, did not pay for it. **It devolved the floor to the extractor.** Each proprietor policed his own property, at his own expense, with an instrument he owned, applied to an asset he owned. It is the cheapest floor a state can have and the most expensive floor an *order* can have, because it must be maintained continuously, everywhere, in every field, for as long as the colony exists — and because it is paid for out of the same human capital it consumes.

The hunters

Beyond the plantation gate the order needed a hunting arm, and the shape of that arm is the most important thing in this module.

Saint-Domingue received the first *maréchaussée* — mounted rural constabulary — established anywhere overseas by France, set up at the end of the seventeenth century and given its definitive form in 1733. It had three priority missions, and the historians of the French gendarmerie list them in order: the chase after fugitive slaves, the *nègres marrons*; the tracking of deserters from the regular troops and the colonial militias; and the security of the highways, with sundry urban policing. It also had a specific geographical charge, which was to watch the frontier with the Spanish part of the island — under-populated, under-administered, and therefore the land of refuge for maroons and deserters alike. After the Seven Years' War it was strengthened; by 1775 it stood at 380 men, of whom 180 were mounted.

Three hundred and eighty men. Against something approaching half a million. The arithmetic is impossible until one sees what the *maréchaussée* was made of, and here the record is unambiguous: it was manned by free people of colour. Stewart King, whose study of the free coloured population of pre-revolutionary Saint-Domingue is the standard modern account, states the position flatly — about two-thirds of the militia units in the colony were made up of soldiers of colour, and the entire *maréchaussée*, the rural police responsible for hunting down escaped slaves, was composed of them. When, from 1780, the maroon-hunt was taken from the *maréchaussée* and given to five companies of *chasseurs royaux*, those companies too were drawn from the militia companies of the free coloured.

So the caste that the colony legally humiliated — barred from office, from the professions, from the honours, from a hundred sumptuary and civil dignities that Module 2 will enumerate — was the caste that held the guns and rode the roads and brought the runaways back in chains. The white population, thirty thousand or so, did not hunt its own slaves. It paid, taxed, and licensed a middle caste to do it, and that middle caste did it well, because doing it was the one avenue by which a man of colour could accumulate standing, arms, and a service record in a society that offered him nothing else.

And the same logic ran one level further down. In the Bahoruco mountains along the Spanish border, maroon communities had held out for the better part of a century — the French expeditions of 1702, 1719, 1728, 1733, 1740, 1742, 1746,

1757, 1761, and 1777 all failing to destroy them, and the officers' reports describing troops so broken with fatigue that soldiers drank their own urine and the maroons' dogs barked in the night and the woods proved too dense to enter. When force failed, the order did the thing it had always done. In 1782 the French commander Saint-Larry offered terms to the maroon leader Santiago: freedom, in return for hunting down all further runaways and returning them to their owners. Terms were agreed at the end of 1785, and the hundred-odd maroons under Santiago ceased their incursions into the French colony.

Set the three moves in a line and the module's central finding is visible.

The state could not destroy the buccaneers, so it commissioned them, and then — under Tarin de Cussy in the 1680s — enlisted them to suppress their former companions. The state could not police the enslaved, so it armed the free coloured and set them to hunt. The state could not destroy the maroons, so it freed the maroons who would hunt maroons. At every level of the coercive apparatus, from Tortuga to the Bahoruco, the floor of Saint-Domingue was manned by men it had beaten and then bought. It is a technique, and it is astonishingly cheap: it converts an enemy into an enforcer at the price of the thing he most wants, and it costs the state nothing but a title, a commission, or a paper of freedom.

It also has a bill, and the bill will be presented in Modules 8, 9, and 10. An order that builds its coercive arm out of the people it excludes has, at the end, an excluded population that is armed, drilled, organised, and experienced in war — and that holds no belief binding it to the order it serves, because the order never gave it one. When the free coloured companies of Saint-Domingue crossed to Savannah in 1779 as the Chasseurs-Volontaires and covered the retreat of a beaten Franco-American army, they came home with something the colony had not intended to give them. André Rigaud was among them; the tradition that the future Henri Christophe was also there is often repeated and is not securely established. What is not in doubt is that the men who commanded the armies of the 1790s had been trained inside the floor they would eventually break.

The door that was not there

Module 5 will price the cost column and ask why the individual subject did not revolt. Module 1's remaining task is to show why he could not simply leave.

The colony sat on the western third of an island. There was no landward exit except across the Spanish frontier — which the *maréchaussée* was specifically charged with watching, and beyond which lay a Spanish colony that returned fugitives by treaty and by police convention. There was the sea, and the sea was owned. There were the mountains, and the mountains were real: the Bahoruco, the Montagne Noire, the wooded interior of the southern peninsula. Grand *marronnage* existed, it was persistent, it was armed, and Module 4 will argue that what grew in those mountains was the most important thing the enslaved built for themselves under the floor. But it was never an exit for the mass. The recorded runaway figures compiled from the colonial press — the *Affiches Américaines* printed the notices, master by master, name by name — peak at around 820 in 1785 and around 817 in 1789, against a population approaching half a million. Flight was a hazard the system priced and absorbed, not a door.

The law of flight was Article 38 of the *Code Noir*, and it was written to be read aloud. A slave in flight for one month from the day his master denounced him in court would have his ears cut off and be branded with a fleur-de-lys on one shoulder; a second month, and he would have his hamstring cut and be branded on the other shoulder; and the third time, he would be put to death.

The administration of the hunt was more revealing than the punishment. A captured runaway was lodged in the *geôle*, the colonial gaol, and by a regulation of 1767 his master had three months to come and fetch him. If no master came, the person was sold at auction — under the legal category of *épave*. The word is the ordinary French for a wreck, a piece of flotsam, a thing washed up and belonging to nobody. A human being who fled an owner and was not reclaimed did not thereby become free. He became salvage.

The founding legend and the violence it covers

The framework's last demand of Module 1 is to set the founding legend beside the violence it obscures. Saint-Domingue's legend needs no reconstruction, because it was said openly and everywhere: *la perle des Antilles*, the pearl of the Antilles, the richest colony on the face of the earth, producing by 1789 something approaching half of all the sugar and coffee consumed in Europe and the Americas, from a territory the size of Belgium, and standing as the proof of French genius in commerce

and administration. Its monument is Moreau de Saint-Méry's vast *Description* of the French part of the island, compiled by a colonial lawyer and published in 1797 — a work of enormous and genuine erudition, parish by parish, road by road, crop by crop, and a book in which the machinery of the floor appears as *police*, as good order, as the reasonable arrangement of a well-run place.

Beside that, set Girod-Chantrans, a serving French officer, describing what he actually saw in the same fields in the same decade: a driver with a great whip, and men and women worked harder than any beast and cared for less. Neither man is lying. Each is standing in a different position and seeing what his position puts in front of him — and the distance between the two is not a moral gap but the seam itself, which is Module 7's subject. What Module 1 establishes is only that the seam had something to hide, and that the thing it had to hide was not an exceptional cruelty but the ordinary daily operation of the order.

Reading the floor against the framework

The module returns three refinements, and one of them is large.

The floor can be bought instead of fought, and where it is, the founding violence is offshored. The framework's Module 1 assumes a conquest: an armed force, a defeated population, a date. Saint-Domingue has none, and the collection should say so plainly rather than force the case into the template. **A coloniser can acquire his subject population by purchase, and when he does, the constitutive violence is performed on another continent by parties he can disown, and enters his own records not as war but as a price per unit.** Three consequences follow, and each will be tested downstream. The order has no local conquest to sanctify, so its robe (Module 3) must sanctify a *trade* rather than a victory — which is a much harder thing to make sacred, and a partial explanation of why the robe of this colony was so thin. The seam (Module 7) is structurally easier to hold open than in any other case in the corpus, because the worst of the violence occurred where no metropolitan Frenchman ever had to look at it. And the floor is *recurrent* rather than founding: because the purchased subjects died faster than they were replaced by birth, the constitutive act had to be repeated every single year, for a century, which means the colony's dependence on the Atlantic was not commercial but existential, and cutting that artery — as war and blockade eventually would — attacks the floor directly.

Where there is no substrate to rent, the floor is devolved to the extractor, and paid for out of the asset. The Vietnam study found a coloniser renting a Confucian village and a mandarinate to police the people for nothing. Saint-Domingue had nothing to rent, and so the state did the only other cheap thing available: it did not build a public coercive apparatus at all, but licensed each proprietor to hold his own ground with his own whip at his own expense. The refinement to add is that this is not the absence of a cost column but its *privatisation* — and that a privatised floor is invisible in the state's accounts while being colossal in the order's, since it is defrayed in the steady destruction of the very human capital the order exists to exploit. Whoever audits only the royal budget will conclude that Saint-Domingue was cheap to hold. It was the most expensive order in this collection, and the bill was paid in bodies.

Co-optation of the hunted into the hunt — a Menu technique the corpus has not yet named. The Menu's *Co-opt* family describes binding a potentially rival *elite* to the centre by kinship, patronage, or shared doctrine. Saint-Domingue ran the same logic on the coercive apparatus itself and one level down the social scale: buccaneers set to suppress buccaneers, an excluded free coloured caste set to hunt the enslaved, maroons freed on condition of hunting maroons. Name it, and add it to the Menu as a variant with its own signature. Its advantage is that it is nearly free, and that it converts the order's most dangerous men into its most motivated enforcers by giving each of them exactly the one thing his position makes him want. Its cost is deferred, and it is enormous: the order arms and trains the class it insults, gives that class a monopoly of martial competence outside the tiny white population, and offers it no belief and no path by which it might come to think the order rightful. It thereby manufactures, with great care and over three generations, precisely the counter-elite that *Elite Chaos* says every rupture requires — and it will hand that counter-elite the crowd, the guns, and the training, and then wait for Paris to crack.

And the revealed-preference test, which Landscape I applied at the founding, gives the same reading here at the working level. The order spent lavishly on force: the whip on every gang, the *maréchaussée* on every road, the gaol in every town, the notices in every issue of the *Affiches*. It spent nothing on belief. Surveillance, the framework says, is the tell of a belief that never took — and Saint-Domingue is the colder case still, an order that never attempted the belief, because it had bought its subjects and calculated that it would be cheaper to replace them than to persuade

them. That calculation is the whole colony in one line, and it held for a hundred years. Legibility is not pardon: to say that the arithmetic worked is not to say that it was anything other than what it was.

A note on sources. The primary quotations are public-domain and given as sources reproducing them give them. The *Encyclopédie* entry *Piece d'inde* is quoted from a reproduction of the ARTFL text of the first Paris folio (vol. 12, p. 567); the folio itself has not been consulted for this module, and the wording should be checked against it before the study is compiled. The *Code Noir* articles 15, 16, 38, 42 and 43 are quoted from the full text of the edict of March 1685 published by the Fondation pour la mémoire de l'esclavage and cross-checked as set out in Landscape I. Girod-Chantrans's description of the atelier is from *Voyage d'un Suisse dans différentes colonies d'Amérique pendant la dernière guerre* (Neuchâtel, 1785), quoted from a source reproducing the passage; the volume is available in facsimile and the wording should likewise be checked against it. The bibliographical existence of Moreau de Saint-Méry's *Description topographique... de la partie française de l'isle Saint-Domingue* (Philadelphia, 1797) and his *Loix et constitutions des colonies françoises de l'Amérique sous le Vent* (1784–90) is established; no wording is quoted from either here.

Modern scholarship is paraphrased and credited. The composition and history of the *maréchaussée* — the first French overseas *maréchaussée*, established at the end of the seventeenth century, given definitive form in 1733, charged with hunting fugitive slaves, tracking deserters, watching the Spanish frontier and policing the highways, standing at 380 men (180 mounted) by 1775, and losing the maroon-hunt in 1780 to five companies of *chasseurs royaux* drawn from the free coloured militia — follows the French gendarmerie-history literature. The statement that the *maréchaussée* was composed of free people of colour, and that roughly two-thirds of the colony's militia companies were units of colour, follows Stewart R. King, *Blue Coat or Powdered Wig: Free People of Color in Pre-revolutionary Saint-Domingue*. The Bahoruco maroon sequence, the failed expeditions, and the terms offered by Saint-Larry to Santiago in 1782 and agreed at the end of 1785 follow the standard accounts and the specialist literature on the Maniel; the number of maroons under Santiago is given as the sources give it (upwards of a hundred) and should be treated as approximate. The runaway figures peaking at about 820 in 1785 and about 817 in 1789, and the 1767 regulation giving masters three months to reclaim a captured runaway before he was sold as an *épave*, derive from the work on the *Affiches Américaines* notices (Crystal Eddins; Jean-Louis Donnadieu) and are paraphrased.

Contested figures are given as ranges. The enslaved population in 1789 is given as roughly 465,000–500,000; the 1788 census figures (27,717 whites; 21,808 free people of colour; 405,464 enslaved) are given as returned and flagged as a probable undercount. Total Africans landed in the colony between 1681 and 1791 are given as roughly 790,000–900,000, the most commonly cited figure being about 800,000; the

colony's share of the Atlantic trade in 1783–91 is given as about a third; peak annual arrivals are given as between about twenty and forty thousand, a range the sources do not resolve. The number of plantations in 1789 (of the order of eight thousand) and the colony's share of European sugar and coffee consumption are given as the standard accounts give them and will be reconstructed properly in Module 6. The number of regular troops in the colony is deliberately not asserted, no reliable figure having been verified for this module; the qualitative point — that the regulars were quartered in the towns and were not the instrument of rural control — follows the administrative literature. The scholarly reading of the *Code Noir*'s protective articles as widely unenforced is the common ground of both the critical and the revisionist literature, and is stated as such.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHT PARTS

Module 2 · The Settlement — who got what; a title deed that conveyed people with the soil; and a boundary that, when too many of the excluded had climbed over it, was moved from a status men could earn to a substance they could not

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The unit of the settlement

Everything in Saint-Domingue was owned through one instrument, and the framework's instruction is to name that instrument as the floor's primary fiction before hunting for the doctrine laid on top of it. The instrument is the *habitation* — the estate — and the fiction is that a deed to land conveys human beings along with the soil.

The land came, at first, by concession: grants made by the governors on behalf of the crown to men who would clear and plant, which is how the buccaneers of Landscape I became proprietors. Thereafter it moved by the ordinary machinery of French civil law — sale, mortgage, dowry, inheritance under the Coutume de Paris — and by the end of the colony's life there were something in the order of eight thousand estates. Sugar took the irrigated plains: the Plaine du Nord behind Cap-Français, the Cul-de-Sac behind Port-au-Prince, the Artibonite. Coffee, introduced in the 1720s and by mid-century planted in the tens of millions of trees, took the mountains. Indigo, cotton, and cacao took what was left. The great sugar estates were few, capital-hungry, and often held by absentees who had gone home to France and left the works to a *procureur*, a *gérant*, and an *économe*; the coffee estates were many, smaller, and far more widely distributed — a fact that will matter greatly in a moment.

The *Code Noir* welded the two halves of the asset together in law. Article 44 had made the enslaved *meubles*, movable goods; but Articles 47 and 48 then bolted the movable to the immovable. A husband, wife, and their pre-pubescent children under one master could not be seized and sold separately, and separate sales were declared null. And the enslaved actually working a sugar works, an indigo works, or a plantation, aged from fourteen to sixty, could not be seized for debt at all — save for the price of their own purchase, or where the works itself was seized; and it was forbidden, on pain of nullity, to proceed to seizure and judicial sale of a sugar works, an indigo works, or a plantation *without including the negroes of that age actually working there*.

Read that as the framework requires. The law did not merely permit the ownership of persons; it fused persons and property into a single indivisible asset that could not be pulled apart even by a creditor. The estate *was* its people. That is the settlement's foundational legal fiction, and it has a consequence which no one in 1685 could have intended and which Module 10 will collect: when the enslaved of the northern plain rose in August 1791 and burned the mills, they were not destroying their owners' property and freeing themselves as two separate acts. They *were* the property. The two acts were one.

The four estates

The colony's population divided into castes whose boundaries the law drew and redrew, and the numbers, given as ranges because the censuses were imperfect and the enslaved were undercounted, ran roughly as follows on the eve of the rising. Whites: somewhere between about 28,000 and 40,000. Free people of colour: somewhere between about 22,000 and 30,000, though some contemporary reckonings ran higher. The enslaved: between about 465,000 and 500,000. The official census of 1788 returned 27,717 whites, 21,808 free people of colour, and 405,464 enslaved.

At the top stood the *grands blancs* — the sugar planters, the great merchants of Cap-Français and Port-au-Prince, the royal officials, the officers. Many were minor nobility; a good number were absentees, and the absentee planter, drawing his income in Paris or Bordeaux from an estate he had not seen in a decade, is a figure to hold in mind, because his managers had every incentive to work the atelier to death and none to preserve it.

Beneath them the *petits blancs* — artisans, shopkeepers, clerks, sailors, soldiers, overseers, and the drifting European poor. They owned little or nothing. What they owned was their colour, and it is worth stating plainly that this was, for many of them, their *entire capital*: the one asset that placed them above a man who might be richer, better educated, and better armed than they were. Remember that when the politics begin.

Then the *gens de couleur libres* — free people of colour, the caste on which this module turns. They were free; the *Code Noir* had said so and said what it entailed. Many were the children of white planters by enslaved women, freed and sometimes acknowledged and sometimes educated in France. Many held land. They dominated the coffee districts of the South and the West. They were substantial slaveholders: the standard reckonings give them ownership of somewhere between a quarter and a third of the enslaved population of the colony, and a comparable share of the plantation property. Julien Raimond, a *quarteron* indigo planter of the South, was a wealthy man who would carry the case of his caste to Paris. And — as Module 1 established — they *were* the colony's coercive apparatus: the whole of the *maréchaussée* that hunted maroons, and about two-thirds of the militia companies.

At the bottom, the enslaved, of whom Article 28 of the *Code Noir* said what was necessary: they could have nothing that was not their master's, and everything that came to them by industry or by the liberality of others was acquired in full property to the master.

So the settlement had, in its middle, a caste that was economically *inside* — owning land, owning people, paying taxes, and holding the guns — and legally *outside*. That contradiction is the subject of the rest of this module, and it is the whole of Module 9.

The marker at the founding, and the marker at the end

Go back to 1685 and read the boundary as the founding law drew it.

«Octroyons aux affranchis les mêmes droits, privilèges et immunités dont jouissent les personnes nées libres ; voulons que le mérite d'une liberté acquise produise en eux, tant pour leurs personnes que pour leurs biens, les mêmes effets que le bonheur de la liberté naturelle cause à nos autres sujets.» We grant to the freed the same rights, privileges and immunities enjoyed by persons born free; we will that the merit of a liberty

acquired produce in them, for their persons and their goods alike, the same effects as the happiness of natural liberty causes in our other subjects. That is Article 59, and Article 57 had already declared that manumission in the islands stood in place of birth there, so that the freed needed no letters of naturalisation to enjoy the advantages of the king's natural subjects, even if born in foreign countries.

The boundary of the settlement in 1685 was therefore **free or unfree** — and freedom was *acquirable*. A man could be manumitted. A man's father could free him. A man could buy himself. Colour is not the marker; the *Code Noir* barely mentions it as a legal category at all.

Now read the boundary as it stood a century later, and read it in the order in which it was built, because the sequence is the argument.

In the 1720s the phrase *libres de couleur* begins to appear in the local and royal ordinances of Saint-Domingue, marking off a category distinct from the *nègres affranchis* of the founding law — the first appearance of colour where the *Code Noir* had put only status. On 3 March 1764 free people of colour were forbidden to practise medicine and surgery. On 9 February 1765 they were forbidden to assemble among themselves under pretext of weddings, feasts, or dances, on pain of a fine of three hundred livres and, on a repetition, of the loss of their liberty. On 1 March 1766 an ordinance provided that a free person of colour who harboured a maroon should be deprived of his freedom and sold for the king's profit — a freedom, that is, held on condition of good behaviour, which is not a freedom. In 1773 a règlement of the administrators, registered at the Conseil supérieur of Port-au-Prince on 16 July of that year, forbade people of colour to bear the surname of any white family of the colony; mothers were to give their children a surname drawn from an African idiom, or from their trade or their colour, but never one belonging to a white family. In 1781 the *curés* and public officers were forbidden to give free people of colour the titles of *sieur* and *dame*. In 1783 they were forbidden to bear arms or to assemble without the permission of the king's procurator or the quarter commander, and forbidden to buy gunpowder without a permit. They were shut out of the liberal professions and the offices of justice, barred from the sword, told what they might wear, and told where they might sit.

And the metropole did the same thing, in the same decade, and for a reason that is more instructive than any of the colonial ordinances.

On 9 August 1777, at Versailles, Louis XVI issued the *Déclaration du roi pour la police des Noirs*. Its first article: *«Faisons défenses expresses à tous nos Sujets, de quelque qualité & condition qu'ils soient, même à tous Étrangers, d'amener dans notre Royaume... aucun Noir, Mulâtre, ou autres Gens de couleur de l'un & de l'autre sexe, & de les y retenir à leur service ; le tout à peine de trois mille livres d'amende.»* Its second: *«Défendons pareillement, sous les mêmes peines, à tous Noirs, Mulâtres ou autres Gens de couleur... qui ne seroient point en service, d'entrer à l'avenir dans notre Royaume, sous quelque cause & prétexte que ce soit.»* No black, mulatto, or other person of colour, of either sex, may be brought into the kingdom; and none not in service may enter it at all.

Note the words. The metropolitan legislation of 1716 and 1738 had regulated *slaves* — and the Parlement of Paris had refused to register those texts, because they trespassed on the principle that the soil of France was free soil and no man could be a slave upon it. The declaration of 1777 solved that problem by changing the category. It regulated not a status but a colour: *Noirs, Mulâtres, ou autres Gens de couleur*, without regard to whether they were enslaved, freed, or free-born. And so drafted, it passed. The historians dispute how far "*noir*" in these texts remained a euphemism for "slave" rather than a genuine racial category, and the dispute is real and should be held open. But the mechanism is not in dispute: a court that would not license a law about slavery would license a law about blackness, and the ministry wrote the law it could get registered. Race, here, is not merely a prejudice. It is a *legislative technique*.

The survey of blood

A boundary of that kind has to be locatable, and so the colony produced the instrument by which it could be located, and it is one of the strangest documents in this collection.

Médéric-Louis-Élie Moreau de Saint-Méry — a colonial lawyer, member of the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français, later a deputy of the Revolution and later still a bookseller in Philadelphia, and the man who assembled the *Loix et constitutions* of the French windward colonies — set out in his *Description* of the French part of Saint-Domingue a system in which every human being is composed of one hundred and twenty-eight parts. A *nègre* has one hundred and twenty-eight black parts; a *blanc* has one hundred and twenty-eight white parts; and everything between is arithmetic. As

the tables are commonly reproduced: *sacatra*, eight to twenty-three white parts; *griffe*, twenty-four to thirty-nine; *marabou*, forty to forty-eight; *mulâtre*, forty-nine to seventy; *quarteron*, seventy-one to one hundred; *métis*, one hundred and one to one hundred and twelve; *mamelouc*, one hundred and thirteen to one hundred and twenty; *quarteronné*, one hundred and twenty-one to one hundred and twenty-four; *sang-mêlé*, one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and twenty-seven. (The reproductions differ slightly at the boundaries and the point should not be pressed on any single figure.) And Moreau then enumerated the routes: twelve distinct combinations of parents that would produce a *mulâtre*; twenty that would produce a *quarteron*; and so on down the ladder, with what one modern historian has fairly called infinite care devoted to the detection of the minutest strain of black inheritance — until, at *sang-mêlé*, one hundred and twenty-six parts white and two parts black, the science is still able to find the two.

The framework's discipline forbids treating this as a curiosity or as evidence merely of the author's derangement. It is an instrument, and its function is exact. It is a *cadastral survey of blood* — the same kind of document as a land register, produced for the same reason, which is that a boundary which carries property rights must be surveyed if it is to be enforced. The colony had moved the marker of its settlement from a status to a substance, and a substance in the blood cannot be seen. So it had to be computed. The one hundred and twenty-eight parts are what a settlement does when its boundary has become invisible and it still needs to know, in every disputed case, which side of it a man stands on.

Why the marker moved

The framework explains this without malice and without a conspiracy, by asking what the position offered and what the men in it could see.

Through the first half of the eighteenth century, the free coloured population was small and poor and no threat to anyone. Then it grew — by manumission, by inheritance from white fathers, by purchase, by the coffee boom that opened the mountains to men without the capital for a sugar works — until, by the 1770s and 1780s, it was numerous, propertied, armed, trained, taxed, and in many cases better off than the *petits blancs* and not visibly inferior to a good many *grands blancs*. It owned, on the standard reckonings, a quarter to a third of the colony's enslaved. It

manned the entire rural police. Its sons went to France for their education, and — until 1777 — could go.

And on the plain construction of the colony's own founding law, this caste was already *inside*. Article 59 said so in terms: the same rights, privileges and immunities as the free-born.

A settlement in that position has three courses. It can admit them. It can expel them. Or it can move the marker. Saint-Domingue moved the marker — and it moved it, precisely, from a status that could be earned to a substance that could not.

This is the module's contribution to the framework, and it should be stated as a general finding, because the corpus will meet it again. **Where the boundary of a settlement is defined by an acquirable qualification, and enough of the excluded acquire it, the settlement does not open. It relocates the boundary onto something unacquirable — and, the new boundary being invisible, it will then build an apparatus of measurement to locate it.** The taxonomy is not the cause of the exclusion; it is the *survey instrument the exclusion required* once the exclusion had ceased to be legible on the face of a manumission paper. This is worth setting beside the Ottoman *devshirme* in the Menu's Prevent family: the Ottomans prevented a rival class from forming at all, by recruiting from outside and denying heredity. Saint-Domingue permitted the class to form, and then, when it had formed, racialised the door. It is the Prevent solution attempted a century too late, on a class that was already inside the house.

And the price of it should be counted here rather than left to Module 11, because it is the single most expensive decision in the colony's history. The whites of Saint-Domingue took a caste that owned a quarter to a third of their slaves, held their entire rural police, carried their muskets, had fought for France at Savannah, and possessed the most direct material interest in the survival of slavery of any group in the colony except themselves — and legislated it into an enemy. They had a natural ally and they manufactured a counter-elite. They did it over sixty years, ordinance by ordinance, and the driving energy came not chiefly from the great planters, who could deal with a rich *quarteron* and often were his father, but from below: from the *petits blancs*, whose only capital was the line, and for whom a wealthy man of colour was not a rival but a *refutation*.

Reading the settlement against the framework

Three refinements, and one check.

The moving marker, stated above, is the large one, and it generalises: a caste boundary migrates from the acquirable to the unacquirable under pressure from below, and generates a science of measurement as it goes.

The line is policed hardest from just above it. The corpus has generally located the defence of a settlement in those with most to lose. Saint-Domingue says otherwise, and the correction is worth carrying. The fiercest defenders of the colour line were not the men with the most property but the men whose *only* property was their position on the right side of it. A *grand blanc* could compromise with a rich free coloured planter and lose little; a *petit blanc* who conceded the line lost everything he had, because the line was everything he had. Expect this in every caste order: the boundary is enforced most savagely by the poorest of the included.

The habitation as the fiction, and the fusion it created. Where the settlement runs by law, the law is the robe; and here the legal instrument does something more than license a share of the violence-monopoly. By fusing land and people into one inseparable asset (Articles 47 and 48), it made the labour force *identical with the capital*. That is a piece of legal engineering with an unintended terminal property, and the collection should note it: in an order where the extracted are legally the same object as the means of extraction, a revolt of the extracted is not an attack on production — it is the *liquidation of the estate*, and there is nothing left to concede, because the thing the owner would have to concede is the asset itself. That is one structural reason why Saint-Domingue could not do what the British Caribbean eventually did, and buy its way out.

And the three-monopoly check comes out anomalous, which is the finding. The framework expects violence, wealth, and trusted information to be held together by one coalition, each leg defending the others. In Saint-Domingue they were not. Trusted information was held by the whites and the metropole — that is Module 3 and Module 7. But *wealth* was held by the whites and, to the tune of a quarter or a third, by the free coloured; and *organised violence*, at the level where it actually operated on the ground, was held by the whites in law and executed by the free coloured in fact. The middle caste held a real share of two of the three legs of the tripod, and had been granted no share whatever of the standing that would have

made it loyal. An order that arms a class, enriches it, and then insults it has not built a tripod. It has built a fault, and it has run the fault directly beneath its own floor.

Legibility is not pardon, and the arithmetic here is not an excuse. But the arithmetic is the point of the module: on the eve of the rising, the colony's *own* settlement contained the counter-elite that *Elite Chaos* says every rupture requires, fully formed, fully armed, and holding a legal grievance drafted in the language of the colony's own founding law. It needed only a crack in Paris. Module 9 will show it reaching for that crack, and Module 10 will show it opening.

A note on sources. Primary quotations are public-domain and given as sources reproducing them give them. The *Code Noir* articles 28, 44, 47, 48, 57 and 59 are quoted from the full text of the edict of March 1685 as published by the Fondation pour la mémoire de l'esclavage and cross-checked as described in Landscape I. The *Déclaration du roi pour la police des Noirs*, given at Versailles on 9 August 1777 and registered in the Parlement of Paris on 27 August, is quoted (Articles I and II) from the Wikisource transcription of the printed declaration, cross-checked against a facsimile held in the Manioc digital library. The 128-part classification is Moreau de Saint-Méry's, from his *Description topographique, physique, civile, politique et historique de la partie française de l'isle Saint-Domingue* (Philadelphia, 1797); the scale is given here as it is commonly reproduced, and the reproductions differ at several of the boundaries, so no single figure should be pressed — the structure, not the arithmetic, is what is being reported. Moreau's *Loix et constitutions des colonies françoises de l'Amérique sous le Vent* (1784–90) is the compilation from which most of the colonial ordinances cited below are ultimately drawn.

The ladder of discriminatory legislation is paraphrased from the specialist literature (Jean-François Niort on the condition of free people of colour in the French islands; Carminella Biondi; the French gendarmerie and colonial-law scholarship) and from the standard reference accounts. The dates given — the appearance of *libres de couleur* as a legal category in the 1720s; the exclusion from medicine and surgery of 3 March 1764; the prohibition on assembly of 9 February 1765 with its penalty of 300 livres and loss of liberty on repetition; the ordinance of 1 March 1766 on harbouring maroons; the 1773 règlement on surnames, registered at the Conseil supérieur of Port-au-Prince on 16 July 1773; the 1781 prohibition on the titles *sieur* and *dame*; and the 1783 restrictions on arms, assembly and gunpowder — are given as the sources give them, with the caution that some of these measures were general to the French Antilles and were promulgated at different dates in different colonies, and that several were, in practice, poorly observed. The reading of the 1777 declaration's shift from status to colour as a device to circumvent the Parlement of Paris's refusal to register the texts of 1716 and 1738 follows the recent French scholarship; the counter-reading, that *noir* in these texts remained a euphemism for *esclave* rather than a racial category, is contested in the literature and is noted rather than resolved. The *arrêt* of the Conseil d'État of 5 April 1778 touching marriages is not relied on here, its scope being genuinely disputed.

Contested figures are given as ranges: whites c. 28,000–40,000; free people of colour c. 22,000–30,000; enslaved c. 465,000–500,000; the 1788 census returns (27,717 / 21,808 / 405,464) given as returned and flagged as an undercount of the enslaved. The share of the enslaved owned by free people of colour is given as a quarter to a third, which is the range the standard accounts give (Herodote's synthesis; John Garrigus; Stewart King); it should be treated as an estimate and not a measurement, and the share of *land* held by the caste is less securely established than the share of persons. The figure of about eight thousand estates in 1789, and the geography of sugar in the plains and coffee in the mountains, are given as the standard accounts give them and are reconstructed with their output figures in Module 6.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*

ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO PITY THEM

Module 3 · The Robe — a doctrine that had to sanctify a trade rather than a conquest, cut for the metropole and never for the ruled; refuted in print by the metropole's own most authoritative books at the very height of the extraction; and rewritten, in 1789, into a weapon the excluded could pick up

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

What there was to sanctify

Every robe in this collection is cut to fit an act. Rome's fitted a conquest; the Ottoman sultan's fitted a conquest; the French in Algeria dressed a conquest; Buganda's kings dressed a conquest so old it had become the shape of the world. A robe over a conquest has material to work with. Conquest can be told as providence, as the punishment of a wicked prince, as the bringing of law to the lawless, as the vindication of a just cause — and the men who did it can be made into founders.

Saint-Domingue had no conquest. Module 1 established what it had instead: a purchase, performed continuously, on another continent, by other hands, in which Frenchmen bought human beings on a beach and shipped them across an ocean to be worked until they died. There is no providence in a bill of lading. The colony's robe therefore had to do a harder thing than any other in this collection. It had to make a *trade* sacred.

And the framework's second question sharpens the first: whose recognition did this robe require? Not the ruled's. The floor of Saint-Domingue never asked the enslaved for their belief, never offered them a doctrine to hold, never built the institutions by which a doctrine could have been transmitted — that is Module 4, and it is the coldest module in the study. The colony's need for belief pointed the other way, back across the Atlantic, to the men who financed the voyages and manned

the ships and voted the naval estimates and wrote the law, and who were the only people on earth in a position to stop the whole thing.

The prediction the framework makes for a colonial order is therefore confirmed here in its purest form. **The robe was reversed.** It was cut for the metropole.

The four claims

Four claims were made, and they were made in this order of importance, which is not the order in which they are usually remembered.

The legal claim, which was the load-bearing one. The law is the robe. The *Code Noir* is sixty articles of careful, procedural, entirely respectable royal legislation, sealed in green wax on silk cords in the form the chancery reserved for perpetual acts, registered in the sovereign councils, cited by judges. Its central provision — Article 44, declaring the enslaved to be *meubles*, movable goods — is a legal fiction, and the whole dignity of the instrument is the argument. This is not brigandage. This is *law*, promulgated by the Most Christian King, and a man who obeys it is not a slaver but a subject. That is the deepest thing the robe did, and it did it without ever having to say a word about race.

The religious claim, which was the oldest and the cheapest. Article 2 of the same edict: *«Tous les esclaves qui seront dans nos îles seront baptisés et instruits dans la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine.»* All the slaves who shall be in our islands shall be baptised and instructed in the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion. Read structurally, this is the sentence that converts a commercial operation into a missionary one. The middle passage delivers souls to salvation; the plantation is a school of grace; the planter is not an exploiter but a guardian of the baptised. It is the most respectable argument in the arsenal and it cost precisely nothing to make, because — as Module 4 will demonstrate — the instruction promised in Article 2 was never delivered in any form worth the name, and the colony did not spend a livre trying.

The mercantile claim, which was the one that actually worked in Paris. France cannot be a great power without a navy. A navy needs money and seamen. Money and seamen come from the colonial trade. The colonial trade is sugar and coffee. Sugar and coffee are made by slaves. Therefore the trade in slaves is a *necessity of state*. This argument was made openly, in the ministries and in the chambers of commerce

of Nantes and Bordeaux, and it was never seriously embarrassed, because it was true — which is the most uncomfortable thing about it. Montesquieu himself, adopting the slaver's voice, put it in a single line that no defender of the trade would have disowned: *«Le sucre serait trop cher, si l'on ne faisait travailler la plante qui le produit par des esclaves.»* Sugar would be too dear, if the plant that produces it were not worked by slaves.

And the racial claim, which came last. This is worth stating carefully, because the order in which the claims arrived is itself evidence. The *Code Noir* of 1685 does not rest on a theory of racial inferiority. It rests on status, and it says — in Articles 57 and 59, quoted in Module 2 — that a freed man has the rights of the free-born. The racial doctrine grew up across the eighteenth century, hardening exactly in step with the moving marker of Module 2, and it reached its final form in Moreau de Saint-Méry's survey of blood. It was not the foundation of the settlement. It was the *justification the settlement needed after it had moved its boundary onto blood* — which is to say that the doctrine did not produce the exclusion; the exclusion produced the doctrine.

The century that knew

Now set the words beside the words, and let the gap speak.

Module 1 quoted the *Encyclopédie*, volume twelve, published in 1765, under the heading *Commerce*: *piece d'inde* — a man or a woman from fifteen to twenty-five or thirty years at most, sound, well made, not lame, and with all his teeth. A unit of account for people.

Volume sixteen of the same work, published in the same year, under the heading *Commerce d'Afrique*, carries the article *Traite des nègres*, written by the Chevalier Louis de Jaucourt, who wrote perhaps a quarter of the whole *Encyclopédie*. It opens with a definition and then it does not stop: *«C'est l'achat des nègres que font les Européens sur les côtes d'Afrique, pour employer ces malheureux dans leurs colonies en qualité d'esclaves. Cet achat de nègres, pour les réduire en esclavage, est un négoce qui viole la religion, la morale, les lois naturelles, et tous les droits de la nature humaine.»* It is the purchase of negroes made by Europeans on the coasts of Africa, to employ these unfortunates in their colonies as slaves. This purchase of negroes, to reduce

them to slavery, is a trade which violates religion, morality, natural law, and all the rights of human nature.

And then, having stated it, Jaucourt draws the conclusion in terms that leave nothing standing: *«aucun homme n'a droit de les acheter ou de s'en rendre le maître ; les hommes et leur liberté ne sont point un objet de commerce ; ils ne peuvent être ni vendus, ni achetés, ni payés à aucun prix.»* No man has the right to buy them or to make himself their master; men and their liberty are not an object of commerce; they can be neither sold, nor bought, nor paid for at any price. There is not one of these unfortunates, he goes on, who has not the right to be declared free; the sale is void in itself; and a judge in a free country who does not liberate him on the instant commits a manifest inhumanity.

Hold the two volumes in the mind together. The same work. The same editors. The same subscription, the same shelves, the same libraries — including the libraries of Cap-Français. Within a single set of books, the greatest compendium of knowledge the age produced defined a human being as a unit of account and demonstrated that the trade in human beings was void in law, in morality, and in religion. And nothing whatever happened. Sugar production rose. Slave arrivals rose. The colony's most profitable years were still ahead of it.

Nor was Jaucourt the first, or the loudest. Seventeen years earlier, in the most widely read work of political philosophy in Europe, Montesquieu had put the whole robe into the mouth of the men who wore it, and let it hang itself:

«Si j'avais à soutenir le droit que nous avons eu de rendre les nègres esclaves, voici ce que je dirais : Les peuples d'Europe ayant exterminé ceux de l'Amérique, ils ont dû mettre en esclavage ceux de l'Afrique, pour s'en servir à défricher tant de terres. Le sucre serait trop cher, si l'on ne faisait travailler la plante qui le produit par des esclaves. Ceux dont il s'agit sont noirs depuis les pieds jusqu'à la tête ; et ils ont le nez si écrasé qu'il est presque impossible de les plaindre. On ne peut se mettre dans l'esprit que Dieu, qui est un être très sage, ait mis une âme, surtout une âme bonne, dans un corps tout noir…»

If I had to defend the right we have had to make negroes slaves, this is what I should say: the peoples of Europe having exterminated those of America, they had to enslave those of Africa, to use them to clear so much land. Sugar would be too dear, if the plant that produces it were not worked by slaves. Those in question are black from head to foot; and they have so flat a nose that it is almost impossible to pity

them. One cannot get it into one's head that God, who is a very wise being, should have put a soul, above all a good soul, into a wholly black body.

And then the sentence that this module is built on:

«Il est impossible que nous supposions que ces gens-là soient des hommes ; parce que, si nous les supposions des hommes, on commencerait à croire que nous ne sommes pas nous-mêmes chrétiens.»

It is impossible that we should suppose these people to be men; because, if we supposed them men, one would begin to believe that we are not ourselves Christians.

That is not merely satire. It is a structural statement about what a robe is *for*, and the framework should take it as such. Montesquieu is saying, in 1748, that the doctrine of the inferiority of the enslaved is not a belief that produces the practice. It is a belief that the practice *requires* — and requires not for the sake of the enslaved, who are not listening, but for the sake of the enslavers, who must go on being able to describe themselves as Christians. The robe is worn to protect the wearer's account of himself. Everything that follows in this module follows from that.

And in 1780, in the third edition of the *Histoire des deux Indes* — one of the great bestsellers of the century, in the libraries of the colony as well as the metropole — Diderot, writing in the abbé Raynal's book, looked at the maroon settlements in the mountains and named them *«des éclairs qui annoncent la foudre»*, lightning-flashes that announce the thunderbolt, and went on: *«il ne manque aux nègres qu'un chef assez courageux, pour les conduire à la vengeance et au carnage. Où est-il, ce grand homme, que la nature doit à ses enfants vexés, opprimés, tourmentés ? Où est-il ? Il paraîtra, n'en doutons point, il se montrera, il lèvera l'étendard sacré de la liberté.»* The negroes want nothing but a leader courageous enough to lead them to vengeance and to carnage. Where is he, that great man whom nature owes to her vexed, oppressed, tormented children? Where is he? He will appear, let us not doubt it; he will show himself; he will raise the sacred standard of liberty.

The prophecy was printed, sold, translated, and reprinted for eleven years, and then it came true.

The tell

Here is the finding, and it is what this module contributes.

The framework asks whether a doctrine is *tested* or *revealed*, and whether the powerful sincerely believe it. Saint-Domingue supplies a cleaner test than either, and one the corpus has not yet formalised. **The metropole published the complete refutation of its own colonial robe, in its own most authoritative books, at the exact moment of maximum extraction — and nothing changed.** Not the trade, not the output, not the law, not the price of a *pièce d'Inde*. The colony's greatest decade came after Montesquieu, after Jaucourt, after Raynal.

An order whose legitimating doctrine is publicly demolished by its own most respected authorities, and which then enjoys its most profitable years, was not being held up by that doctrine. The robe was not load-bearing. It was never load-bearing. It could not be, because the people it would have had to hold — the half-million in the fields — were never wearing it, and the people who *were* wearing it were three thousand miles away and had a floor doing the work.

Call this the **decorative robe**, and add it to the framework as a category with its own test. Where the extracted are held entirely by force, and the beneficiaries are separated from them by a distance across which no accountability travels, the robe's function collapses. It stops being *legitimation* — the making of an order into the furniture of reality for those who live inside it — and becomes *comfort*: the making of an order bearable to those who profit from it at a distance. A comfort-robe need not be coherent. It need not be believed. It need not survive contact with the metropole's own philosophy, because nothing rests on it. And its diagnostic is exactly the one Saint-Domingue supplies: publish the refutation, and see whether anything moves. If nothing moves, the robe was decorative, and the order is running on the floor alone.

The corollary is where it earns its place in the collection. **A decorative robe is catastrophically weak in a crisis.** A robe that holds an order together is a thing men will die for, and Vietnam's mandarinate and Buganda's kingship both demonstrate it. A robe that merely lets men sleep is a thing they will drop the instant it becomes expensive. When the will of the metropole emptied — and it emptied, as Module 10 will show, not because the enslaved beat the floor but because Paris fractured — there was nothing whatever in French belief holding Saint-Domingue that was worth the life of a single Frenchman. The Convention abolished slavery in the colonies on 16 pluviôse an II with a show of hands and an ovation, and the men who voted for it had been reading Jaucourt for thirty years.

Two robes, and the boundary drawn between them

The seam of a colonial order, the framework predicts, is split in two by distance: what is hidden from the metropole is what the conquered live, and the order's core task is keeping the two ends from meeting. Saint-Domingue ran this in the form of two robes. To Paris: necessity, salvation, law, the pearl of the Antilles. To the colony: race, and the whip. The Atlantic policed the distance between them, and for a century it held.

Then, on 26 August 1789, the National Assembly wrote the first article of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen: *«Les hommes naissent et demeurent libres et égaux en droits.»* Men are born and remain free and equal in rights.

The robe cut for the metropole now said, in language no one could misread and everyone could quote, that the order in the colony was illegitimate. The two robes could not both be worn.

And the Assembly — which contained colonial deputies, and on which the planters' Club Massiac worked hard and effectively — did not choose between them. It legislated a boundary. By the decree of 8 March 1790, on Barnave's report, the colonies were constituted a case apart: each was invited to make known its wish *«sur la constitution, la législation et l'administration qui conviennent à la prospérité et au bonheur de ses habitants»*, subject only to conforming to the general principles binding the colonies to the metropole. The principle acquired a name — *spécialité* — and it meant precisely what it was designed to mean. The Declaration was for France. The colonies had their own régime.

The framework should carry this as a named move. **When the metropolitan robe is rewritten in terms that condemn the colony, the order does not abandon either robe and does not reconcile them. It draws a jurisdictional line between them and calls the line a constitutional principle.** *Spécialité* is the seam of Module 7, given a legal name and a date.

It did not hold for two years, and it did not hold for the reason that ought to have been obvious to everyone in the chamber. The men it was drafted to exclude could read.

Did they believe it?

The framework's deviation test — does behaviour change when observation lapses? — gives a divided answer here, and the division is the honest finding.

The planters' conduct is flatly inconsistent with the racial doctrine at precisely the point where inconsistency cost them most. They fathered children by enslaved women; they freed them; they acknowledged them; they sent them to France to be educated; they left them land and slaves. The *gens de couleur libres* of Module 2 — twenty or thirty thousand of them, holding a quarter to a third of the colony's enslaved — exist *because* the men who promulgated the doctrine of blood did not conduct their private lives as though they believed it. Moreau de Saint-Méry, who built the survey of one hundred and twenty-eight parts, was a Creole lawyer who lived his whole life among the people he was measuring, and married and dined and litigated among them.

But the collection's own discipline forbids the easy conclusion. *The Architect and the Inheritor* is the correction, and it applies with full force. That the origin of a belief was built does not make the belief a lie; it makes it a thing that was built and then became real. By the third Creole generation the colour line was not an argument the whites of Saint-Domingue made — it was the furniture of their reality, seen the way a man sees that a chair is a chair. And the *petits blancs*, whose entire capital was the line, held it with a ferocity in which there was nothing calculating at all, because for them it was not a doctrine but a floor. The doctrine was cynical in its construction and sincere in its inheritance, and both statements are true, and the framework already knows how to hold them together.

What the doctrine never was, at any point in the colony's hundred years, was *believed by the ruled*. And that single absence is the whole difference between Saint-Domingue and every other order in this collection.

Reading the robe against the framework

Four refinements.

The trusted-information leg was forged, because it could not be inherited or redirected. Landscape I established that the recursion failed here — the prior order was exterminated rather than naturalised, and a vacancy cannot be rented. The consequence lands in this module. There was no priesthood to capture, no calendar

to co-opt, no sacred kingship to inherit, no shrine whose keys could be taken. Everything the robe was made of had to be manufactured from nothing, in French, out of French materials, for a French audience. Manufactured doctrine is the most expensive kind and the most brittle, and Saint-Domingue's was both.

The decorative robe, with its test, stated above: where the ruled are held by force alone and the beneficiaries are at a distance, the robe's function collapses from legitimation into comfort — and a comfort-robe survives the publication of its own refutation, because nothing rests on it, and collapses the moment it costs anything, for the same reason.

Montesquieu's law of the robe. The doctrine of the inferiority of the ruled is not the cause of the practice but the condition of the ruler's self-description. *If we supposed them men, one would begin to believe that we are not ourselves Christians.* Generalise it: a robe is cut to exactly the thickness required to protect the account its wearer gives of himself, and no thicker. Where the wearer's self-account is all that is at stake — where he is not being asked to fight, or to pay, or to look — a very thin robe will do. That is why the metropole's robe could be as flimsy as it was, and why it tore so easily in 1789.

Spécialité: the seam given a legal name. When the two robes met, the order neither chose nor reconciled. It drew a jurisdictional boundary and constitutionalised it. Module 9 will show Vincent Ogé and Julien Raimond walking straight at that boundary with the metropole's own text in their hands, and Module 10 will show what came through the gap when it broke.

Legibility is not pardon. It is worth saying at the end of a module built out of the *Encyclopédie* and the *Esprit des lois* that the point of assembling these quotations is not to convict the Enlightenment of hypocrisy, which is easy, nor to excuse the colony on the ground that its own century condemned it, which is worse. The point is structural, and it is bleak. The condemnation was published, and it was correct, and it was famous, and it changed nothing for forty years — because the order it condemned was not held up by anything the condemnation could reach. Doctrine did not build Saint-Domingue and doctrine could not take it down. It took the collapse of a state.

A note on sources. The primary quotations are public-domain and are given as the sources reproducing them give them. Montesquieu, *De l'esprit des lois* (1748), Book XV, chapter 5, *De l'esclavage des nègres*, is quoted from the text as presented in the Bibliothèque nationale de France's Montesquieu exhibition and cross-checked against several independent reproductions, which agree save for trivial variants (*surtout bonne / surtout une âme bonne*; *conventions / conventions inutiles*). Louis de Jaucourt's article *Traite des nègres* is from the *Encyclopédie*, volume XVI (1765; the article is often dated 1766); it is quoted from reproductions of the text rather than the folio, and the wording is consistent across all of them. The *Encyclopédie*'s *Piece d'inde* entry (vol. 12, p. 567) carries the same caveat entered in Module 1: it is quoted from a reproduction of the ARTFL text and should be checked against the folio before compilation. The passage on the maroons as lightning before the thunderbolt and on the coming leader is from the *Histoire philosophique et politique des deux Indes* (third edition, 1780); it is attributed in the modern scholarship to Diderot rather than to Raynal, and is quoted from a reproduction. *Code Noir* articles 2 and 44 are quoted from the full text of the edict of March 1685 as published by the Fondation pour la mémoire de l'esclavage, cross-checked as set out in Landscape I. Article 1 of the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* of 26 August 1789 is quoted from the official text.

Modern scholarship is paraphrased and credited. The account of the decree of 8 March 1790 — Barnave's report, the principle of *spécialité*, and the wording of its first article inviting each colony to make known its wish on the constitution, legislation and administration suited to the prosperity and happiness of its inhabitants, subject to the general principles binding the colonies to the metropole — follows the French constitutional-history literature on the colonies and the Revolution, and the *Archives parlementaires* record of the sitting of 8 March 1790 which that literature cites. The influence of the Club Massiac is as the standard accounts give it. The claim that the Jesuits' instruction of the enslaved alarmed the planters is not asserted here; it belongs to Module 4 and will be verified there.

No figures are contested in this module. The chronological claim on which the central argument rests — that the colony's peak years of slave importation and sugar and coffee output came *after* the publication of Montesquieu (1748), Jaucourt (1765) and Raynal-Diderot (1770–80) — is secure on any of the reckonings given in Module 1 and will be quantified in Module 6.

LAWS WITHOUT APPEAL

Module 4 · Formation — an order that did not merely withhold instruction but prohibited it, and expelled the priests who gave it; an atomisation defeated by its own appetite; and the substrate the enslaved built beneath the floor, which the colony's own great lawyer described in the vocabulary of kingship and oath and law, and filed under superstition

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The formation that was promised

Article 2 of the *Code Noir* is the colony's promise, and it is unambiguous: *«Tous les esclaves qui seront dans nos îles seront baptisés et instruits dans la religion catholique, apostolique et romaine.»* All the slaves who shall be in our islands shall be baptised and instructed in the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion. Article 3 forbade any other public worship. Article 6 commanded rest on Sundays and feast days. On the face of the founding law, Saint-Domingue was to be a Catholic society in which every person, whatever his condition, was catechised.

Set beside that promise the only figure that matters. By the middle of the eighteenth century, in the North — the richest and most heavily worked province of the colony — the Jesuit mission consisted of some fourteen priests, and the enslaved population committed to their care numbered on the order of seventy thousand.

There were no schools for the enslaved. There was no catechism in any language they had brought with them, except what individual missionaries improvised. There was no literacy, no seminary, no scholarship, no ladder. The colony that produced more sugar than any territory on earth, and that maintained a rural constabulary, a militia, a *geôle* in every town, and a weekly newspaper carrying advertisements for runaways, did not build a single institution for the formation of the four hundred and sixty-five thousand people who made its wealth.

The Vietnam study found a coloniser who paid nothing for formation because he did not have to: a Confucian village, a lineage hall, a mandarinate and a calendar were

already forming the people, for free, and the Frenchman simply rented them. Landscape I established why Saint-Domingue could not do the same. The prior order here was not naturalised; it was destroyed. There was nothing to rent.

But the absence of a substrate does not, by itself, explain the absence of a colonial formation. France could have built one. It had the doctrine, the Church, the money, and its own founding law commanding it. **It did not fail to form the enslaved. It refused to.** And it wrote down why.

The formation that was forbidden

The Jesuits came to the North of Saint-Domingue in 1704, sent to relieve the Capuchins, who could not supply the men. They were never numerous. But some of them did the thing the *Code Noir* had commanded, and did it seriously — Father Boutin learning African languages in order to reach his congregation, and running what the order called the *cure des nègres*, the cure of souls of the blacks.

The colony destroyed them for it.

In December 1762 the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français issued an *arrêt* accusing the Jesuits of flattering the negroes. An ordinance of the king followed on 21 July 1763, and on 24 November 1763 the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français handed down its definitive judgment: the expulsion of every Jesuit from Saint-Domingue. This was ten years before Clement XIV suppressed the Society of Jesus, and it was not done for the reasons that expelled the order from Portugal or from metropolitan France. It was done for what they had been doing to the enslaved.

The charges, as the historians of the Church in Haiti report them, are the most revealing document in this module. The Jesuits were reproached with preaching to the negroes and gathering them together, and thereby obliging the planters to delay the work. They were reproached with pushing negroes and negresses living in concubinage to marry legitimately — *which removed from the master the faculty of dividing his slaves, injured the right of property, and compromised the necessary submission*. And they were reproached with instructing the blacks in religion out of the presence of whites, and instructing them too particularly: with revealing to them *the sublimity of their being, the majesty of man and his hopes*, at the risk of awakening in them *subversive ideas of equality*.

Read that slowly, because it is the whole module.

The colony expelled its priests for obeying Article 2 of its own founding law. Formation was not neglected in Saint-Domingue through indifference, or poverty, or distance, or the shortage of clergy — though all four were real. It was **prohibited**, by a reasoned judgment of the colony's highest court, on the explicit ground that a man who is instructed begins to believe he is a man.

The framework predicts that a colonial order withholds formation from the majority because to form them would be to admit them. Saint-Domingue is the limit case, and it does not merely illustrate the prediction. It states it, in the charge sheet, in the first person. They understood exactly what formation does. That is why they would not have it.

And note the second charge, which is the coldest thing in this study so far. The Jesuits were condemned for *marrying people*. Legitimate marriage was an offence because it removed from the master *la faculté de diviser les esclaves* — the faculty of dividing his slaves. The atomisation of the enslaved was not a by-product of the trade or an accident of the plantation. It was a **property right**, defended in court, by name.

Legibility is not pardon, and it cuts on every side here. The Jesuits were not abolitionists, and the order's own doctrine in the French islands supplies its own indictment: a Jesuit of the Antilles could write that the mission to the negroes had this advantage, that its fruit was sure and constant, without fear that after instruction and baptism they would fall back into infidelity — because they are the servants of our Frenchmen, on whom they depend for everything, and so are obliged, out of self-interest and human respect, to frequent the church and the sacraments, whereas infidels who are their own masters abandon the faith the moment the missionary leaves. The men who fought hardest to instruct the enslaved understood perfectly that slavery was what made the convert stay.

What the atomisation actually achieved

This study's own brief predicted that the enslaved were drawn from many African societies and *deliberately mixed to prevent solidarity*. The intent is now documented: it is written into the Jesuits' charge sheet. But the brief instructed that the prediction be tested and not assumed, and when it is tested it does not hold. **The policy of atomisation failed, and it failed for a reason that goes to the heart of what this colony was.**

Begin with the fact that governs everything else. At the end of the eighteenth century, roughly two-thirds of the enslaved people of Saint-Domingue had been born in Africa.

That is not a colony that had absorbed and remade a population. It is a colony full of recent arrivals who remembered another world — who had known freedom, kinship, law, religion, and in many cases war, and had known them within living memory. And the reason is the arithmetic Module 6 will price: the enslaved population of Saint-Domingue did not reproduce itself. It was consumed and replaced. **An order that kills its people faster than they are born cannot creolise them. It must keep importing the world it is trying to erase.**

Then consider what the trade actually delivered. It did not deliver a random scatter of individuals from a hundred peoples. It was a bulk logistics operation, buying twenty to forty thousand people a year, in concentrated bursts, from a handful of stretches of coast — and a purchasing pattern like that produces concentration whatever the buyer intends. The figures are contested and belong to one of the liveliest disputes in the field, so they must be given as a range and with the dispute named. On David Geggus's dataset of more than thirty-one thousand enslaved workers of known origin, people classed as "Congo" — West-Central Africans — make up something on the order of a quarter of the enslaved population of the colony; John Thornton, Christina Mobley and James Sweet argue for a considerably larger cultural weight, and Geggus's "Kongomania" articles argue in reply that the influence has been overstated. Fongbe speakers (the *Arada*, *Adia*, *Fond*, *Fouëda*) run to about six per cent colony-wide but some sixteen per cent of Africans on the northern sugar estates, and were predominantly female; Yoruba speakers about five per cent. The ethnonyms themselves are European constructs, as Arlette Gautier has shown — "Congo" meant, in practice, anyone who spoke a Bantu language, and "Mandingue" anyone who spoke a Mande one — which both flattens real diversity *and* confirms that broad zones of mutual intelligibility were arriving together.

And there was something else in the cargo, which the colony bought without knowing it had bought it.

The regions the trade drew on hardest were regions at war. The civil wars of Kongo and the campaigns of Dahomey and its adversaries produced captives, and captives taken in war are frequently soldiers. Thornton's argument is that this transmitted African military experience directly into Saint-Domingue; Geggus, who

has spent two decades resisting the inflation of West-Central African influence, concedes this point, and pairs it with an observation that ought to be set in stone: perhaps a third of the enslaved population came from war-torn societies, and most of the European troops and militia sent to Saint-Domingue in the 1790s **had military training and no combat experience at all.**

Module 1 established that this colony bought its floor rather than fighting for it. Module 4 adds the item that was not on the invoice. **Where a floor is purchased rather than conquered, the seller determines what the buyer receives — and a slave trade fed by wars delivers veterans.**

What grew underneath

Into the space where a formation should have been, and where the order had forbidden one to be, the enslaved built their own. Three things grew, and the colony's own greatest scholar described all three, and understood none of them.

The first was a religion. Médéric-Louis-Élie Moreau de Saint-Méry — the lawyer who compiled the *Loix et constitutions* of the French windward colonies in six volumes, the man who knew more about the law of Saint-Domingue than any person alive — set down in his *Description* what he had learned of the *Vaudoux*:

«Selon les nègres aradas, qui sont les véritables sectateurs du Vaudoux dans la colonie, et qui en maintiennent les principes et les règles, Vaudoux signifie un être tout-puissant et surnaturel, dont dépendent tous les événements qui se passent sur ce globe. Or, cet être c'est le serpent non venimeux, ou une espèce de couleuvre, et c'est sous ses auspices que se rassemblent tous ceux qui professent la même doctrine.»

According to the Arada negroes, who are the true adherents of the Vaudoux in the colony, and who maintain its principles and its rules, Vaudoux signifies an all-powerful and supernatural being, upon whom depend all the events that come to pass upon this globe. Now, that being is the non-venomous serpent, a kind of grass-snake, and it is under its auspices that all who profess the same doctrine assemble.

He describes the assembly: a king and a queen at one end of the room, an altar, a box in which the serpent is kept and through whose bars every initiate may see it. He describes the possession of the priestess, who is *«pénétrée du dieu»*, filled with the god, her body convulsed, the oracle speaking through her mouth. And then he writes the sentence that gives this module its title:

«…elle dicte comme des lois sans appel, tout ce qu'il lui plaît de prescrire, au nom de la couleuvre, à la troupe imbécile, qui n'oppose jamais le plus petit doute à la plus monstrueuse absurdité, et qui ne sait qu'obéir à ce qui lui est despotiquement prescrit.»

She dictates, as laws without appeal, whatever it pleases her to prescribe, in the name of the serpent, to the imbecile troop, which never raises the smallest doubt against the most monstrous absurdity, and which knows only how to obey what is despotically prescribed to it.

Strip away the contempt, which is loud, and look at the vocabulary the man reaches for, which is exact. A king. A queen. An altar. An oath. *Laws without appeal.* Obedience. He has walked into a functioning order — one that appoints authority the colony did not appoint, binds strangers into a congregation, administers an oath, and issues commands that are obeyed — and he has written it all down, in the vocabulary of sovereignty, and filed it under superstition.

He is not stupid. He is the most learned man in the colony. He simply has no category that will let him see it. His own doctrine — the doctrine of Module 3, the survey of one hundred and twenty-eight parts that he himself built — has already told him what these people are. A man who has classified his subjects as goods cannot recognise their institutions as institutions.

The second was a language, and here the finding inverts the expectation entirely.

Kreyòl was not a secret tongue that the enslaved kept from their masters. It was the language of the colony. Moreau himself, printing the earliest known Creole text, wrote that it was in this language that the Creoles liked to converse among themselves, and that the negroes had no other language among themselves at all. Girod-Chantrans, the Swiss officer whose description of the atelier Module 1 quoted, was scandalised to find the daughters of the white Creole aristocracy of Saint-Domingue speaking nothing else. And in 1802 S. J. Ducœurjoly published a *Manuel des habitans de Saint-Domingue* containing a French–Creole dictionary and model conversations — because a Frenchman arriving in the richest colony France possessed needed a phrasebook to do business in it.

Its vocabulary comes overwhelmingly from eighteenth-century French. Its grammatical structure comes substantially from West African languages, and the genesis of creoles is a contested field in which no account should be stated as settled. But the direction of the borrowing is not in dispute, and the direction is the point.

The masters supplied the words. The enslaved supplied the grammar. And the masters had to learn it in order to be obeyed.

Then follow the consequence. In 1793 and after, when the civil commissioners of the French Republic wanted to speak to the enslaved population of Saint-Domingue — to proclaim, to threaten, to offer freedom, to raise soldiers — they had to have their decrees *translated into Kreyòl and read aloud on the plantations*. The Republic could not reach the people of its own richest colony in its own language. It had to enter theirs.

The third was the maroon communities, which Module 1 has already counted and Module 5 will price. What Module 4 adds is only this: the numbers were small — recorded flight peaking at around eight hundred in a year against a population approaching half a million — but their function was not numerical. For a century, in the Bahoruco and the Montagne Noire, they constituted a standing demonstration that the floor had an edge, and that on the far side of that edge a society could exist. That is not an escape route. It is a proof.

Reading formation against the framework

This module returns more to the framework than any other in the study so far, and one of the returns is a correction to the study's own brief.

First: formation was prohibited, not merely withheld — and the prohibition was reasoned. The framework predicts that a coloniser withholds formation because forming the ruled would mean admitting them. Saint-Domingue supplies the charge sheet: the priests were expelled for revealing to the enslaved the majesty of man, at the risk of awakening subversive ideas of equality. Add the marriage clause and the prediction sharpens further. Atomisation here was not a consequence of the trade but a **property right** — *la faculté de diviser les esclaves* — asserted in a court of law against a religious order that was trying to marry people. The framework should carry the distinction: *withheld* formation is a cost saved; *prohibited* formation is a policy defended, and an order that defends it in court has told you precisely what it is afraid of.

Second: the logistics beat the policy, and two dials the framework treats as independent turn out to be geared together. Saint-Domingue intended to atomise and could not. Its extraction ran at the fork's limit — consuming people faster than

they were born — and the necessary consequence was that the population had to be continuously replaced from Africa, so that two-thirds of it remained African-born to the very end. Meanwhile a trade buying tens of thousands of people a year from a handful of coasts could not deliver a scatter; it delivered blocs. **Maximum extraction destroys formation-suppression.** An order that consumes its people must keep importing the world it is trying to erase, and it must import that world in bulk. The colony's appetite defeated its own policy, and it was the appetite, not the policy, that the colony could not give up.

Third: the purchased soldier. Where the floor is bought rather than fought, the seller decides what is delivered. A slave trade fed by African wars delivers men who have fought in them. The colony that faced the rising of 1791 was facing, in part, veterans — while the European troops sent against it were trained and unblooded.

Fourth, and this is the correction the sources force on the brief. The study's own seed anticipated a counter-formation that the coloniser *could not see, could not rent, and could not police*. The evidence gives something more exact and considerably more damning. He *could* see it: Moreau saw it, described it minutely, and printed it in the standard work of reference on the colony. He *could* police it, after a fashion, and did — the assemblies were banned, the gatherings hunted, the leaders burned. What he could not do was **rent** it.

And that is the whole distance between Saint-Domingue and Vietnam. The French in Indochina could rent the Confucian village because a French administrator's own categories permitted him to look at a village council, a lineage hall and a mandarin's examination and *recognise a government*. He could see an order there, so he could hire it. The same French mind, looking at a Vaudoux assembly with a king, a queen, an oath and laws without appeal, could see only *la troupe imbécile*. So he could ban it, and he could not use it.

Therefore, added to the framework: **a substrate can be borrowed only by a coloniser whose own doctrine permits him to recognise it as an order. Where his robe forbids that recognition, the substrate does not go away — it goes out of his reach.** This is Module 3's decorative robe presenting its bill, and the bill is enormous. The doctrine that made the enslaved into goods made their institutions invisible *as institutions*, and so converted the one asset a coloniser most needs — a self-running order beneath his own — into an asset held entirely by his enemies.

Fifth: the forfeited medium. A coloniser who withholds formation does not merely fail to form his subjects. He forfeits the *channel*. Having built no schools, no catechism, no press, no clergy that spoke to the enslaved, the order found itself conducting its own daily business inside a language its subjects had built the grammar of — and when, in 1793, a message arrived from Paris that the planters would have given anything to suppress, it travelled in Kreyòl, at the speed of Kreyòl, through networks made in the *hounfour* and on the road to market, and there was no counter-channel, because the order had abolished the possibility of one a century earlier when it put its priests on a ship.

And sixth, the guardrail, stated plainly, because everything above can be misread. All of this explains **capacity**, not **causation**. A substrate is what makes coordinated action possible *when an opening appears*. It does not make the opening. The substrate was there in 1758, and Makandal was burned. It was there in the Bahoruco for a hundred years, and in 1785 the colony bought the maroons off with their own freedom and set them to hunting other maroons. It was there in 1790 when Vincent Ogé came home with a decree of the National Assembly in his hand — and Ogé was broken on the wheel. What was different in 1791 was not the substrate, and was not the courage, and was not the organisation. **What was different was in Paris.**

Module 4 exists so that when the floor cracks, we understand why there was something ready underneath it. It does not exist to pretend that the thing underneath cracked the floor.

A note on sources. The primary quotations are public-domain and are given as the sources reproducing them give them. *Code Noir* articles 2, 3 and 6 are quoted from the full text of the edict of March 1685 published by the Fondation pour la mémoire de l'esclavage, cross-checked as set out in Landscape I. The passages from Moreau de Saint-Méry on the *Vaudoux* are from his *Description topographique, physique, civile, politique et historique de la partie française de l'isle Saint-Domingue* (Philadelphia, 1797); they are quoted here from reproductions of the French text, not from the folio, and their wording — including the phrase *lois sans appel* on which this module's title rests — must be checked against the original or against the 1958 Maurel–Taillemite edition before the study is compiled. This is a load-bearing quotation and the flag is deliberate. The widely circulated English rendering of the *Vaudoux* passages (Ivor D. Spencer's 1985 abridged translation) is a modern copyrighted text and has not been quoted; the translations here are our own from the French.

The Jesuit expulsion is dated from the ecclesiastical-history literature: the mission's establishment in the North in 1704 in place of the Capuchins; the *arrêt* of the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français of December 1762; the royal ordinance of 21 July 1763; and the definitive *arrêt* of the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français of 24 November 1763 expelling the order from the colony. **The charges against the Jesuits are reported here in indirect speech and are not presented as a verbatim quotation of the *arrêt*.** They are as summarised in the modern literature on the Church in Saint-Domingue and in Haitian press accounts drawing on it, and the actual wording of the judgment has *not* been verified for this module. If the *arrêt*'s own language can be recovered it should replace this paraphrase, because it is the most important document cited in the study so far and it deserves to be quoted exactly. The figure of some fourteen Jesuits responsible for approximately seventy thousand enslaved people in the North around 1750 is from the scholarly literature and is paraphrased. The Jesuit reflection on the security of conversions among the enslaved is from the seventeenth-century missionary correspondence of the French Antilles (Father Jean Mongin) and is *not* specific to Saint-Domingue; it is given as evidence of the order's doctrine in the French islands generally, and is paraphrased rather than quoted.

The demographic material is contested and is given as ranges with the dispute named. The proportion of African-born among the enslaved at the end of the colonial period (around two-thirds) follows Laurent Dubois and the standard accounts. The ethnic proportions follow David Geggus's work on a dataset of more than 31,000 enslaved workers of known origin, and the "Kongomania" exchange in *The Americas* between Geggus on one side and John Thornton, Christina Mobley and James Sweet on the other; the figures given (West-Central Africans around a quarter of the enslaved population; Fongbe speakers around six per cent colony-wide and around sixteen per cent of Africans on northern sugar estates, predominantly female; Yoruba speakers around five per cent; roughly a third of the enslaved drawn from war-torn societies) are Geggus's, and the reader should know that other specialists put West-Central African cultural weight considerably higher. The observation that European troops sent to Saint-Domingue in the 1790s had training but no combat experience is Geggus's own and is paraphrased. The point that colonial ethnonyms were European constructs based on port of embarkation or language group follows Arlette Gautier.

On Kreyòl: the attribution of *Lisette quitté la plaine* to Duvivier de la Mahautière, a white magistrate of the Conseil of Port-au-Prince, and its dating to about 1757, rest on Moreau de Saint-Méry's own statement in 1797; **the 1757 text has never been found**, the poem survives only in later reproductions (Moreau, 1797; Ducœurjoly, 1802–03; and nineteenth-century versions), and these differ from one another, chiefly in orthography. It is quoted from none of them here and is cited only for the

fact of its existence and its authorship. Moreau's remark that the Creoles conversed in this language and that the negroes had no other among themselves is quoted from a reproduction carrying editorial brackets and should be checked against the folio. Girod-Chantrans's indignation at hearing white Creole women speak Creole is reported from the secondary literature. The translation of revolutionary decrees into Kreyòl for reading on the plantations is well attested and is paraphrased from the standard accounts. The genesis of French-lexifier creoles is a live scholarly dispute and no theory of it is asserted here.

The Bois Caïman ceremony of August 1791 is **not** relied upon in this module. Its date, its content, and in part its historicity are disputed in the literature, and it belongs to Module 10, where the dispute will be set out rather than resolved.

MAGICAL PRACTICES, PROVEN AT TRIAL

Module 5 · The Cost Column — why the ordinary subject's ledger came out against revolt; an order that had abolished every channel into its own people and could therefore read them only by torture; a man burned for sorcery in the decade of the Encyclopédie; and Nicolas Le Jeune, acquitted in 1788, explaining why no limit on the master's power was survivable

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

Three ledgers

The framework's question in this module is the individual's, not the order's: for the ordinary subject, why does the ledger come out against revolt? The cost column is the credible enforcer that prices defection too high to choose; the benefit column is what compliance pays. Where the belief is thick, the benefit column carries the load and force withdraws to the margins. Where it is thin, the cost column must be held high by visible force and surveillance — and surveillance is the tell of a belief that never took.

Saint-Domingue must be read three times, because it contained three populations and the ledger came out differently for each.

For the **whites**, the cost column was nearly empty and the benefit column was full. They complied because they were paid — in land, in credit, in a share of the richest agricultural enterprise on earth, and, for the poorest of them, in the standing that Module 2 identified as the *petit blanc*'s only capital. Nobody had to coerce a planter into being a planter.

For the **free people of colour**, the ledger was the strangest in this collection, and Module 9 will pay for the strangeness. They held property, arms, military training, and a quarter to a third of the colony's enslaved. They had a genuine material stake —

and no standing whatever. Their compliance was purchased with the single thing the order was willing to sell them: the right to hunt. As long as the *maréchaussée* was the one ladder in the colony that a man of colour could climb, the ledger held.

For the **enslaved** — four hundred and sixty-five thousand people, better than nine-tenths of the population — the benefit column was empty. Not thin. Empty. Module 3 established that no robe was ever cut for them, and Module 4 that no formation was ever offered and the priests who attempted one were put on a ship. There was nothing in the benefit column at all. **The entire weight of the order therefore rested on the cost column, and this module is an inventory of what that costs.**

The enforcer three feet away

The first dial is the credibility of force: can an enforcer reach the subject, and does he know it?

In most orders in this collection the answer involves distance — a garrison in a provincial town, a magistrate on circuit, a tax-farmer's men once a year. Saint-Domingue devolved the floor to the extractor (Module 1), and the consequence for the individual is total. The enforcer was not in a garrison. He was standing in the row, holding a whip, and he was frequently another enslaved man. There was no distance to be crossed, no delay to be exploited, no ambiguity about whether force would arrive. It was already there, and it had been there since first light.

The law supplied the rest. Article 15 forbade the enslaved to carry any offensive weapon, even a heavy stick. Article 16 forbade them to assemble, by day or night, and enjoined *every* free person in the colony to seize offenders. Article 38 priced flight: ears cut and a *fleur-de-lys* branded for one month's absence, the hamstring cut and a second brand for a second month, death for a third. And Article 42 licensed the master to chain and beat at his own discretion.

Beyond the plantation gate stood the apparatus Module 1 counted: the *maréchaussée* — 380 men, 180 of them mounted, by 1775 — the militia, the *geôle* in every town, and the *Affiches Américaines* printing the runaway notices week by week. And the punishments were staged to be seen. The colony executed by burning and by breaking on the wheel in the public squares of Cap-Français and Port-au-Prince, and it assembled audiences. The named tortures of the plantations — the *quatre-piquets*,

the ladder — entered the colony's own working vocabulary, which is what happens to a practice that is routine.

The scholarship is agreed on the atrocities and the historian must handle them without either flinching or dwelling. Jean-Baptiste Caradeux, called *le cruel*, is reported by Paul Cheney to have buried enslaved people alive, heads exposed, while his guests watched. Pierre de Vaissière, writing in 1909 from the colonial correspondence, cites a settler's letter of 1736 describing the practice of packing a man with gunpowder and firing him. These are the extremes and they were not universal. What was universal was the whip, and the whip was enough.

The second dial is exit, and Module 1 established that the colony had closed it: an island; a sea that belonged to the enemy; a Spanish frontier watched by the *maréchaussée* under treaty and convention; and the *épave* rule of 1767, under which a runaway whose master did not claim him within three months was sold at auction as *salvage*. Manumission existed — it is how the free coloured caste came to exist at all — but it was the master's gift, not the slave's right, and across the century the colony made it harder and dearer.

Both dials therefore stood at maximum: force certain and immediate; exit foreclosed. The Field Manual predicts the result exactly, and Module 6 will price it: *where every door is shut, the floor sinks toward the biological bone — the plantation, the mine.*

And that is the specific fact that made this order a trap rather than a contract. Not the sea, and not the law. It was the fusion Module 2 identified: under Articles 47 and 48, the enslaved *were* the estate. A man could not buy his way out, because he was not a tenant who could pay off a lease — he was the capital. There was nothing to negotiate, because there was no contract, and there was no contract because one of the parties was legally an object.

The blind floor

Now the module's real finding, which comes out of the archive rather than out of the theory, and which the theory did not predict.

In May 1757 the northern plain began to lose cattle and people. Deaths ran through the herds and through the households, white and black alike. The colony concluded that it was being poisoned.

An enslaved man named Médor confessed — the confession is the origin of everything that followed — and an enslaved woman known as Assam was tortured until she named dozens of others. Twenty-one arrests followed, and then nine months of interrogation, conducted with the judicial machinery of the *ancien régime*: the *question*, the *brodequins*, the water. In January 1758 the authorities took the man they had come to regard as the head of the conspiracy: François Makandal, born in Africa, brought as a boy to the Lenormand de Mézy estate at Limbé. Moreau de Saint-Méry, in his parish-by-parish survey, gives him three sentences: «*C'est de l'habitation de M. le Normand de Mézy, au Limbé, que dépendait le nègre Macandal, né en Afrique. Sa main ayant été prise au moulin, il avait fallu la lui couper, & on le fit gardien d'animaux. Il devint fugitif.*» It was to the estate of M. le Normand de Mézy, at Limbé, that the negro Macandal belonged, born in Africa. His hand having been caught in the mill, it had to be cut off, and he was made a keeper of animals. He became a fugitive.

He was a maroon for somewhere between six and eighteen years — the sources will not resolve it — and he was, by every account, a man of formidable capacity: a healer, a herbalist, a man who distributed *paquets*, charged bundles, to a network he had built across the plantations of the North. On 20 January 1758 he was burned alive at Cap-Français, before an audience of enslaved people whom the planters of the surrounding districts had brought in to watch. At the first flames he broke his bonds and came out of the fire. He was seized, bound to a fresh board, and put back into it.

Now read the document the state produced, because the state's own title is the most damning thing in this study.

The royal prosecutor at Cap-Français, Sébastien Jacques Courtin, filed a memorandum. Its title runs: *Mémoire sommaire sur les pratiques magiques et empoisonnements prouvés aux procès instruits et jugés au Cap contre plusieurs Nègres et Négresses dont le chef, nommé François Macandal, a été condamné au feu et exécuté le vingt janvier 1758.* Summary memorandum on the **magical practices** and poisonings **proven at the trials** instituted and judged at Le Cap against several negroes and negresses, whose chief, named François Macandal, was condemned to the fire and executed on the twentieth of January 1758.

Magical practices. Proven at trial.

This is the crown prosecutor of the richest colony on earth, in the decade in which the *Encyclopédie* was coming off the presses in Paris, certifying that sorcery had been

established in evidence. And in the aftermath the colony legislated accordingly, forbidding the enslaved and the free coloured to compose, sell, distribute, or buy *garde-corps* or *makandals* — the small, rough figures of wood or stone credited with supernatural power.

And here is the part that turns it from an atrocity into a structural finding. **It is not clear that there was a conspiracy at all.** The historiography is genuinely divided and must be given as divided: many historians hold that Makandal led a large, coordinated poisoning campaign aimed at destroying the whites of the North, and the tradition is old and serious. But David Geggus and Pierre Pluchon, reading the contemporary records, argue that the scale and the political character have been vastly inflated — that what the documents show is something narrower and more personal. And a strand of modern scholarship attributes much of the mortality of 1757 not to poison at all but to disease: an epizootic moving through the cattle and into the people who ate them. A French document of 1758 put the deaths Makandal had caused at six thousand over three years — a figure Sylviane Diouf reproduces and immediately calls, surely rightly, a great exaggeration.

There is one further thing, and it is the sharpest. The word *poison* was doing double duty across the seam. Among Africans in the colony it named any powerful substance charged by spiritual power — a category of *efficacy*, not of toxicology. The French heard the word and translated it into their own criminal law, where it meant homicide. **The two sides of the plantation were not merely lying to one another. They were not speaking about the same thing.**

What a floor without a robe cannot do

Set the pieces together and the finding is unavoidable, and it is this module's contribution to the framework.

Saint-Domingue had abolished every channel between itself and the people it ruled. It expelled the priests who spoke to them (Module 4). It refused them instruction, in order not to awaken ideas of equality (Module 4). It cut no robe for them and offered them no doctrine to hold (Module 3). It did not even own the language they spoke, but had to borrow theirs to give an order (Module 4).

And so, when the cattle began to die, **the colony had no way of finding out what was happening.**

It had coercion and no intelligence. It possessed the most elaborate apparatus of force in the Atlantic world and not one instrument for reading the minds of the half-million people beneath it. An order in that position cannot distinguish an epizootic from an insurrection, a herbalist from an assassin, a charm from a weapon, a funeral from a conspiracy. Every ambiguous event has two possible readings and no way to choose between them — and so the order resolves the ambiguity by the only instrument it has, which is torture. And torture, as it always does, answered *conspiracy*, because that is the only answer torture can give.

Name it, and add it to the framework:

The blind floor. An order that installs no belief in the ruled installs no *channel* to them either, and thereby loses the capacity to know what they are doing. The framework already holds that surveillance is the tell of a belief that never took. Saint-Domingue shows the stage beyond surveillance, where surveillance itself fails for want of anyone to surveil *with*: the order is reduced to **divination** — to producing knowledge of its subjects by inflicting pain until they say something. And a floor in that condition does not merely become expensive. **It manufactures the conspiracies it fears**, because its only instrument of inquiry is one that generates conspiracies on demand. The cost column, with an empty benefit column beside it and no information to aim by, has no equilibrium. It inflates without limit, because the enemy is invisible and an invisible enemy is an infinite one.

Twenty-one arrests. Nine months of torture. Dozens named by a woman under the *brodequins*. A man burned in the square in front of an audience assembled for the purpose. And, quite possibly, a sick herd.

The brake

Thirty years later the same logic states itself in one sentence, and this time in the words of a man defending himself in court.

In March 1788 fourteen enslaved people walked off the coffee plantation of Nicolas Le Jeune at Plaisance, in the North, and made their way to Cap-Français to lay a complaint before the courts of the king. They said their master had killed four of them and was at that moment torturing two women. The judges appointed a commission; its officers rode to the plantation and found two women, named in the

record as Zabeth and Marie-Rose, in chains, their legs burned with torches, dying. Le Jeune said they were poisoners. No poison was found. Both women died.

The Governor, Vincent de Mazarade, and the Intendant, Barbé de Marbois, saw exactly what they had in their hands, and wrote of a unique opportunity to arrest, by a single example, the course of so many cruelties. They ordered the arrest. Le Jeune fled — and their own subordinates in the North declined to catch him. The Chamber of Agriculture of Cap-Français mobilised. Planters petitioned by the hundred. Seven white witnesses came forward for the defence. And the law itself did the rest of the work, because French colonial law restricted the testimony of enslaved people and required corroboration from free persons.

The court at Le Cap acquitted him. The public prosecutor appealed to the superior council at Port-au-Prince — and on the day of the hearing he did not appear. Le Jeune was acquitted again. In August the Governor and the Intendant wrote to the Minister of Marine about the frustration of justice by their own agents.

Articles 42 and 43 of the *Code Noir* — the articles forbidding torture and mutilation, and commanding the king's officers to prosecute a master who killed — had now been tested, on the best facts the colony would ever produce, in front of the men whose duty it was to enforce them. They did not survive the test.

And Le Jeune, defending himself to the prosecutor, explained precisely why they could not. As Malick Ghachem renders his words: the only thing that prevents the slave from stabbing his master is the absolute power the master holds over him — remove that brake, and the slave will dare anything.

That is the planter's own theory of his order, and it is correct. He is saying, in a single line, everything this study has argued so far: that the benefit column is empty; that nothing but the cost column stands between the master and the knife; and that therefore **any limit whatever on the cost column is an existential threat.** Which is why the colony acquitted him. Not because his judges approved of burning women — the Governor and Intendant plainly did not, and neither did the prosecutor who ran away. They acquitted him because in an order that runs on terror alone, *a law restraining terror cannot be enforced without dismantling the order the law exists to protect.*

The protective articles of the *Code Noir* were not ignored through wickedness or laziness. They were **structurally unenforceable**, and the colony understood this better than Versailles did.

The hidden transcript

The framework's last instruction for this module is to look, at the thin end, for James Scott's *hidden transcript* — compliance as prudent performance rather than belief. Saint-Domingue supplies it in the most economical form available: **the masters believed both things at once.**

The same colony that produced Moreau de Saint-Méry's genial ethnography of the dances and songs of a contented people also produced a poison panic, a permanent rural constabulary, a ban on amulets, and a prosecutor's memorandum on magical practices proven at trial. The whites of Saint-Domingue simultaneously believed that their slaves were happy and that their slaves were poisoning them. The contradiction is not hypocrisy. It is the hidden transcript seen from above: they were reading the public performance and the private reality at the same time, and could not reconcile them, because the performance was designed to be unreadable.

Fourteen of Le Jeune's people walked twenty miles to a courthouse. Until the morning they left, they had been, so far as any overseer could tell, working.

Reading the cost column against the framework

First: the blind floor, stated above, and it is the module's real return. An order with no robe for the ruled has no *instrument* on the ruled either; it must read them by torture; torture manufactures conspiracies; and the cost column therefore has no equilibrium and inflates without limit. The Field Manual says surveillance is the tell of a belief that never took. Saint-Domingue adds the terminal stage: **divination is the tell of a floor that has no surveillance worth the name** — and it is the most expensive information-gathering technology ever devised, because everything it discovers is false.

Second: where the cost column carries the entire load, the law cannot restrain the cost column. This is the Le Jeune finding and it should be carried into every study of a thin-robe order. Protective law addressed to the enforcer is enforceable only where a benefit column exists to absorb the slack. Where compliance rests on terror alone, any limit on terror is correctly read by the enforcers as a threat to the whole structure — and the courts, which are staffed by the enforcers, will therefore not apply it. *The Code Noir's humane articles were unenforceable not despite the order's logic but because of it.* The corollary for the corpus is uncomfortable and worth stating

plainly: **a slave code's protective clauses are a robe for the metropole, not a restraint on the colony** — and Module 3 already told us which audience the robe was cut for.

Third: the ledger, read caste by caste, has already located the fault. For the enslaved the cost column carried everything, and it held — Makandal was burned, the Bahoruco maroons were bought off, and flight ran at eight hundred a year against half a million. This is the framework's regularity and it holds here with brutal exactness: *a rising against an intact floor is crushed.* But the free coloured ledger was balanced on a single item — the right to hunt — and the *petits blancs* were spending the 1770s and 1780s legislating that item away. The order priced its enslaved with total accuracy and its middle caste with none at all.

And the discipline, held. Makandal's courage was real; so was the courage of the fourteen who walked to Le Cap; so was Zabeth's and Marie-Rose's, whatever they said or refused to say while their legs burned. Nothing in this module diminishes any of that, and the framework does not require it to. What the framework requires is the structural sentence, and here it is: **in 1758 the floor was intact, and the man who tested it was burned; in 1788 the floor was intact, and the law that might have restrained it was defeated in open court by the men it bound.** The floor of Saint-Domingue did not fail. It was never beaten. Something else had to happen first, three thousand miles away, and Module 10 will show what.

A note on sources. Primary quotations are public-domain and given as sources reproducing them give them. *Code Noir* articles 15, 16, 38, 42, 43, 47 and 48 are quoted or cited from the full text of the edict of March 1685 published by the Fondation pour la mémoire de l'esclavage, cross-checked as set out in Landscape I. Moreau de Saint-Méry's three sentences on Makandal are from his *Description* (Philadelphia, 1797), quoted from a reproduction and carrying the same folio caveat entered in Modules 1 and 4. The title of Sébastien Jacques Courtin's 1758 memorandum (*Mémoire sommaire sur les pratiques magiques et empoisonnements prouvés aux procès instruits et jugés au Cap contre plusieurs Nègres et Négresses dont le chef, nommé François Macandal, a été condamné au feu et exécuté le vingt janvier 1758*, Archives Nationales, Colonies) is given as the archival citation records it; the document itself has not been consulted, and only its title is relied on here — but the title is the evidence, and it fixes both the date of the execution and the state's own characterisation of the charge.

Nicolas Le Jeune's argument to the prosecutor is given **in indirect speech and in Malick Ghachem's English rendering**, not as a verbatim primary quotation; the French of Le Jeune's letter has

not been verified for this module and should be recovered before compilation, since the sentence is load-bearing. The narrative of the Le Jeune affair — the fourteen who left Plaisance in March 1788; the commission from Le Cap; Zabeth and Marie-Rose found chained and burned; the flight of Le Jeune and the obstruction by local officials; the mobilisation of the Chamber of Agriculture of Cap-Français and the planter petitions; the acquittal at Le Cap; the appeal to Port-au-Prince and the prosecutor's non-appearance; the second acquittal; and the letter of Vincent and Barbé de Marbois to the Minister of Marine of 29 August 1788 — follows Ghachem, *Prosecuting Torture: The Strategic Ethics of Slavery in Pre-Revolutionary Saint-Domingue*, *Law and History Review* 29 (2011), and is paraphrased. The administrators' description of a unique opportunity to arrest, by a single example, the course of so many cruelties is likewise paraphrased from Ghachem's rendering of their letter and is not given as a quotation. One widely repeated line — that the governor wrote that the safety of the colony depended on Le Jeune's acquittal — is *not* used here: it is inconsistent with the governor's documented role as the prosecution's driving force, and until the discrepancy is resolved it is better left out.

The Makandal material is given with its historiographical dispute intact and unresolved, because the dispute is the point. The date of execution (20 January 1758) and the place (Cap-Français) follow Courtin's own title; a minority of reference sources give 17 January, and several popular accounts wrongly place the execution at Port-au-Prince. The duration of his *marronage* is given as a range (six to eighteen years) because the sources do not agree. The arrests of 1757–58, Médor's confession, the torture of Assam, the twenty-one arrests, and the judicial methods used are paraphrased from the scholarly literature. The reading that there was neither a large conspiracy nor a political programme follows David Geggus and Pierre Pluchon; the majority reading, that Makandal led a coordinated campaign of poisoning against the whites of the North, is older and is held by serious historians including Carolyn Fick, and both are stated. The suggestion that much of the 1757 mortality was epizootic disease rather than poisoning is reported as a strand of modern scholarship and is *not* asserted as established. The figure of six thousand deaths over three years is from a French document of 1758, reported by Sylviane Diouf, who regards it as much exaggerated; it is given here only as an example of what the colony believed. The post-execution prohibition on *garde-corps* and *makandals* is reported from Joan Dayan's account and paraphrased. The observation that "poison" named, among Africans in the colony, a category of spiritual efficacy rather than of toxicology, follows the recent literature and is paraphrased.

Caradeux's cruelties are paraphrased from Paul Cheney, *Cul de Sac*. The 1736 settler's letter on the gunpowder atrocity is reported as cited by Pierre de Vaissière (1909) and is *not* quoted; it is at two removes and is given only as an indication of

what the correspondence contains. The *maréchaussée* figures, the *épave* rule of 1767, and the recorded-flight numbers are as established and sourced in Module 1. Population figures are the ranges given in Module 2.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*

THE PLANTATION WITH NO CHILDREN

Module 6 · Extraction — a colony whose output rose while its people fell; the fork the Field Manual does not have, where the producer is himself the purchasable commodity, so that his death is not a loss to the extraction but an order placed with a supplier; and the artery that this made into the order's throat

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

What was taken

The numbers first, because the module turns on an arithmetic and the arithmetic must be laid out before it is read.

In 1789 Saint-Domingue exported something in the order of 86,000 tons of sugar and 35,000 tons of coffee, together with indigo, cotton, cacao and hides. It supplied roughly half the sugar consumed in Europe and something like sixty per cent of the world's coffee. Two decades earlier, in 1767, the figures had been 72 million pounds of raw sugar and 51 million pounds of clayed, a million pounds of indigo, two million of cotton; between 1767 and 1789, on Michel-Rolph Trouillot's reckoning, coffee exports quadrupled in volume and sextupled in value. The colony's share of French external commerce is given in the literature as high as two-thirds, and the figure should be handled with care — it is repeated far more often than it is defined — but no one disputes the direction. A territory the size of a small European province was, by the 1780s, the most valuable piece of ground in the Atlantic world.

The machinery was some 792 to 800 sugar estates, of which the great ones each worked an *atelier* averaging around a hundred and sixty people; something between 2,800 and 3,100 coffee plantations; roughly three thousand indigo works; and several hundred cotton estates. And the geography of the crops was the geography of the castes, as Module 2 established: sugar on the irrigated plains, capital-hungry and held

by the *grands blancs*, many of them absentees drawing their income in Paris; coffee in the mountains, cheaper to enter, and the district in which the free people of colour were strongest.

Two extractions, stacked

The framework asks by what mechanisms the surplus is taken. In Saint-Domingue it was taken twice, and the two takings had different victims, different instruments, and different stories.

The lower extraction — the planter from the enslaved — was labour, taken at the whip, without wage, without limit, and without recourse. Module 5 has established that the recourse did not exist: Articles 42 and 43 of the *Code Noir* were tested in 1788 on the best facts the colony would ever produce, and they failed. Its legitimating story was the *Code Noir* itself (Module 3's legal claim) and, latterly, the doctrine of blood (Module 3's racial claim, arriving last).

The upper extraction — the metropole from the planter — ran through three instruments. The *exclusif*: colonial produce could move only in French ships, through French ports, into French merchants' hands, and foreign vessels were barred from the colony's harbours. Debt: the planters were heavily indebted to the merchants of Nantes, Bordeaux and Le Havre, who financed the estates, sold them their enslaved workforce, and took the crop against the loan. And the crown's own duties on the trade. Its legitimating story was the mercantile claim of Module 3 — the colony exists to enrich the state — and Landscape I found it stated in law as early as the edict of 1674, which took the colony *à notre domaine*, into the king's own estate.

The upper extraction is the more familiar of the two, and it is the one that mattered politically. The colony's production simply outran what legal French bottoms could carry, so the surplus went out illegally: the *gérants* who ran the absentee estates became, in the recent scholarship, the colony's smugglers, and every planter in Saint-Domingue knew that an American ship would pay him more than a Bordeaux house would. The *exclusif* therefore did two things at once. It made a great many Frenchmen rich, and it taught every planter in the colony that Paris was a parasite. Hold that; Module 8 will need it.

And in 1787 the two grievances fused in a single document. The crown promulgated an ordinance protecting absentee proprietors and metropolitan

creditors against their estate managers and debtors — *and*, in the same instrument, restricting the mistreatment of the enslaved. The Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français refused to register it. Versailles abolished the court in January 1787 and moved its powers to Port-au-Prince. Read that sequence twice: the colonists were asked to accept a limit on their creditors and a limit on their whips in one breath, and they refused both, and lost their highest court for it — four years before the rising.

The fork, and the fork the Field Manual does not have

Now the module's real work.

The Field Manual is emphatic that before hunting for a "just enough" equilibrium, one must read whether the thing taken is a **flow** or a **stock**. A flow — harvest, rent, tribute, labour-days — is drawn at a tunable rate; the producer is kept alive because the extractor needs him producing; and the rate settles at the edge of the revolt threshold. A stock — the land itself, taken whole for settlement — has no rate and no equilibrium; the taking is all-or-nothing, and where the dispossessed will not go, the order tends to elimination. That is the fork: extraction-as-rate needs the native alive; extraction-as-dispossession needs him gone.

Saint-Domingue is on neither branch, and the corpus should say so plainly.

Here the thing taken is the *person*, and he is taken in both modes at once. He is worked as a **flow** — cane cut, hogsheads filled, hours in the boiling-house — and he is owned as a **stock**, a body purchased outright at a price quoted in the *Encyclopédie* under *Commerce*. The flow and the stock are the same object. And the moment they are the same object, the mechanism that generates "just enough" in every other extractive order in this collection stops working.

Look at what that mechanism actually is. It is not restraint, and it is not conscience. **It is a feedback loop.** In a tributary order the extractor cannot push a peasant past subsistence, because a dead peasant sows no field next spring; the extractor's own future income is destroyed by the extraction that kills. His interest and the producer's survival coincide, and *that coincidence is what produces the equilibrium*. The rate self-corrects because the extractor is punished by his own excess.

The Atlantic slave trade severed that loop. A dead worker on a Saint-Domingue plantation did not destroy next year's crop. He generated **a purchase order**. There was a market, with an established supply chain, a known price, and twenty to forty

thousand units landing every year in the colony's own harbours. The extractor's future income did not depend on *this* producer's survival, because another was available on credit from the same Bordeaux house that held his mortgage.

And so the hard floor of extraction ceased to be subsistence and became the replacement price. Not what the producer needs in order to live — what a new producer costs. The Field Manual predicts that where every exit is shut the floor sinks toward the biological bone. Saint-Domingue shows what happens when a supply of replacements exists as well: **the floor sinks through the bone**, and it does so without anyone in the colony having to decide that it should.

What the demography says — and what it does not

The signature fact is established beyond argument, and it is the darkest line in this collection. **The enslaved population of Saint-Domingue never reproduced itself.** Deaths outran births, year after year, for a century. The natural decrease is generally put at something between two and five per cent a year; annual mortality on the sugar estates is commonly given at six to ten per cent; and Philip Curtin's work suggests that perhaps a third of newly-landed Africans died within the first year or so — the period the trade called *seasoning*, a word which named mass death as a phase of inventory processing. Hilliard d'Auberteuil, a colonial writer of the 1770s, put the working life of a plantation slave born in the colony at little more than fifteen years.

Set that against Module 1's count. Somewhere between 790,000 and 900,000 Africans were landed in Saint-Domingue between 1681 and 1791. Fewer than half a million were alive when the trade stopped. The colony's output rose without interruption across the same century in which its people fell.

But now the discipline, because this is exactly the point at which a study of this kind goes wrong. The line that everyone repeats — *it was cheaper to work them to death and buy new ones than to improve their conditions* — is widely printed and is **not** securely established as a documented planter calculus. It should not be asserted here, and this study will not assert it. The historians divide, and the division is real:

Carolyn Fick and much of the modern scholarship read the demographic collapse as the direct product of the regime itself — overwork, undernourishment, and what she calls the absolutism of the masters — and locate its cause in the conditions and economic relations of slavery. Curtin and the demographic historians add forces the

planters did not choose and could not fully control: a disease environment to which the newly landed had no resistance; a sex ratio skewed heavily male because planters bought heavily and bought mostly men; fertility suppressed by ill health, malnutrition and exhaustion; and infant mortality of a savagery that is difficult to read about. And the record contains, too, the choices of enslaved women themselves — abortion and infanticide, which the scholarship reports as acts of refusal, and which it would be an evasion to omit and a cheapness to dwell on.

The structural finding survives all of it, and does not depend on intent. Because Curtin's own mechanism, offered by a demographer and not a moralist, is precisely the loop this module is describing, and it is opened not by malice but by a market:

Because replacements could be bought cheaply, planters bought rather than bred. Because they bought, they bought mostly men. Because they bought mostly men, the sex ratio collapsed. Because the sex ratio collapsed — and because the women who were there were worked, starved, and sick — the birth rate collapsed. Because the birth rate collapsed, the population could not replace itself. And so they bought again.

Nobody had to intend this. It runs on its own, and it runs faster the better the market works. **That is the discovery of this module, and it is worse than the story it replaces.** The comfortable version requires monsters — men who sat down with a ledger and calculated that a life was cheaper than a rest. The evidence supports something far more frightening: that a population can be consumed to extinction by ordinary men maximising output against cost, *provided only that a supply of replacements exists*. The colony did not need exceptional cruelty to produce the worst demographic record in the Atlantic world. It needed a functioning trade.

The artery

And here Module 6 hands its finding forward, because the same fact that made the colony rich made it mortal.

An order whose extraction runs *below the reproduction rate of its own labour force* is not merely trading across an ocean. It is **breathing through it**. Every year, twenty to forty thousand people had to come across the water simply to keep the workforce level; the moment they stopped coming, the workforce began to fall at two to five per cent a year, automatically, by arithmetic, without a single act of resistance by anybody.

Module 1 established that this colony bought its floor rather than fighting for it, and had to re-buy it annually. Module 6 supplies the rate, and with it the structural conclusion: **Saint-Domingue had a countdown built into its accounts, and the countdown ran whenever the sea was closed.**

The sea was closed by war. And the war was not fought by the enslaved.

Reading extraction against the framework

First, and largest: the third fork. The Field Manual has two — extraction-as-rate, which needs the producer alive and tends to equilibrium, and extraction-as-dispossession, which needs him gone and tends to elimination. Add the third and name it: **extraction-as-consumption**, in which the *producer himself is the purchasable commodity*, so that he is neither preserved nor removed but **consumed and re-supplied**. It has no equilibrium and no endpoint; it has a *throughput*. And it has a diagnostic that is simple, sharp, and available in any archive that counts: **an extractive order whose output rises while its subject population falls is on this fork, and on no other.**

Second: the replacement price displaces subsistence as the floor. The framework gives two dials — the credibility of force, and the availability of exit — and holds that where both are turned to maximum, extraction sinks toward the biological bone. Saint-Domingue requires a third dial: **the availability of a replacement market.** Where one exists, the hard stop is no longer what the producer needs to live but what a new producer costs, and extraction sinks *below* subsistence without anyone in the order choosing it.

Third, and the general law behind both: the "just enough" equilibrium holds only where the producer is irreplaceable to the extractor. This is worth stating as plainly as the corpus can state anything, because it travels far beyond slavery. The equilibrium of the tributary order is not a moral achievement; it is a *feedback loop*, and the loop closes only because the extractor is punished by his own excess. Sever the loop — by supplying the extractor with cheap producers from outside his own system — and the restraint evaporates, not because anyone became crueller, but because the correction stopped firing. Chattel slavery is the extreme case. It is not the only one, and any order that draws its labour from an inexhaustible external supply should be examined for the same signature.

Fourth: the artery is the throat. An order on the consumption fork has converted its labour supply into an *import*, and imports can be interdicted. It is therefore uniquely vulnerable not to revolt, and not to a fall in commodity prices, but to a **naval interruption** — a vulnerability created entirely by its own success, invisible in its accounts while the ships kept coming, and beyond the power of anybody in the colony to repair. Module 10 will need this.

And the discipline, held. Legibility is not pardon, and the reading offered here is not a mitigation. It is the reverse. To say that Saint-Domingue's extraction did not require monsters is not to excuse the men who ran it; it is to remove the last comfort available to a reader of this history — the comfort of believing that such a thing could only be done by exceptional wickedness, and therefore could not be done again by ordinary men in an ordinary market. The planters of Saint-Domingue were, measured against the extractive elites elsewhere in this corpus, unremarkable. What was remarkable was the price list. **A life had a quotation, and the quotation was lower than the cost of letting a person rest.** Everything else followed, and it followed on its own.

A note on sources. This module quotes no primary text and therefore carries no quotation flags; it rests almost entirely on paraphrased modern scholarship and on figures that are contested, and it is written to make the contest visible rather than to resolve it.

The export figures for 1789 (approximately 86,000 tons of sugar; approximately 35,000 tons of coffee) and for 1767 (72 million pounds of raw sugar, 51 million of clayed, one million of indigo, two million of cotton) are as the standard reference accounts give them and should be treated as orders of magnitude, not measurements. The colony's share of world coffee (around sixty per cent) and of European sugar consumption (around half) is widely reported and consistently so. **The claim that Saint-Domingue accounted for something approaching two-thirds of France's foreign trade is repeated everywhere and defined almost nowhere**; it appears in the literature attached to several different quantities (external commerce, colonial trade, foreign investment) and is given here with that warning attached rather than as an established figure. The growth of coffee exports between 1767 and 1789 (quadrupled in volume, sextupled in value) follows Michel-Rolph Trouillot. Plantation counts (roughly 792–800 sugar; roughly 2,800–3,100 coffee; roughly 3,000 indigo) and the average sugar *atelier* of around 160 people are given as ranges from the standard accounts.

The demographic material is the module's core and is given with its dispute intact. That the enslaved population of Saint-Domingue never reproduced itself is not in

dispute and is stated as fact. The rate of natural decrease (two to five per cent annually) and the annual mortality on sugar estates (six to ten per cent) are as commonly reported and are given as ranges. The estimate that roughly a third of newly landed Africans died within the first year or so of arrival follows Philip Curtin and is paraphrased. The figure of "little more than fifteen years" for the working life of a colony-born plantation slave is attributed to Hilliard d'Auberteuil (*Considérations sur l'état présent de la colonie française de Saint-Domingue*, 1776–77) and is reported **as Carolyn Fick reports it**; d'Auberteuil's own text has not been consulted, and the figure is a contemporary's estimate, not a measurement, and should be checked before compilation. Fick's characterisation of the causes — overwork, undernourishment, and the absolutism of the masters — is paraphrased from *The Making of Haiti*.

The frequently repeated claim that planters found it cheaper to work the enslaved to death and buy replacements than to improve conditions is deliberately NOT asserted in this module. It appears in reference works and in serious writers, but this study has not found it established as a documented calculus, and the argument made here does not require it and is stronger without it. The mechanism relied upon instead — cheap replacements produce heavy buying, heavy buying produces a male-skewed sex ratio, a skewed ratio and a broken workforce produce a collapsed birth rate, and a collapsed birth rate produces more buying — is Curtin's, is offered by him as demography rather than as indictment, and is paraphrased. The reports of abortion and infanticide among enslaved women as acts of refusal are as the scholarship gives them (Fick and others) and are stated without elaboration.

The *exclusif*, the planters' indebtedness to metropolitan merchants, and the smuggling that ran around both are paraphrased from the recent literature on the colony's commerce, including the work on the *gérants* as the colony's hidden-economy traders. The 1787 sequence — the crown's ordinance protecting absentee proprietors and metropolitan creditors and simultaneously restricting the mistreatment of the enslaved; the refusal of the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français to register it; and the abolition of that court by Versailles in January 1787, its powers

passing to Port-au-Prince — is reported from the standard accounts and will be verified in detail in Module 8, where it belongs.

THE DECREE THEY WERE HIDING

Module 7 · Information and Suppression — a seam that ran not between the colony and the enslaved but across three thousand miles of ocean; a censorship whose own judgment reprinted the book it burned; and a rising, in 1791, of men who believed they were enforcing a law their masters were concealing from them

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

Where the seam ran

The framework's instruction is to name the interpreter class — the priesthood, the ulama, the clerisy, the academy, the party — that holds the chokepoint between the people and the knowledge they cannot check, and then to watch it working the two valves: the *inflow*, which feeds an authorised reading through formative institutions, and the *outflow*, which starves the rival reading by banning the book, silencing the heretic, or, more cheaply still, simply leaving the alternative untaught.

Applied to Saint-Domingue, the instruction stalls, and the stall is the finding.

There was no interpreter class standing between the colony and the enslaved, because Module 4 established that the colony had abolished the position. No clergy that preached to them — the Jesuits had been put on a ship in 1763 precisely for preaching to them. No school. No catechism. No press they could read, no formation of any kind. The chokepoint was not held; it was *demolished*. Which means that the seam of this order did not run where a seam normally runs, between the rulers and the ruled.

It ran **across the Atlantic**, and the colonial prediction is confirmed in its sharpest form: the seam split in two by distance, so that what was hidden from the metropole was what the conquered lived, and the order's core task was keeping the two ends

from meeting. Six to ten weeks of ocean did the work that a priesthood does elsewhere.

Who told France what Saint-Domingue was

The interpreter class of this order faced *inward*, toward Paris, and it can be named with precision.

There was Médéric-Louis-Élie Moreau de Saint-Méry — and the reader of this study already knows him three times over. He compiled the *Loix et constitutions* of the French windward colonies in six volumes; he built the survey of blood in one hundred and twenty-eight parts (Module 2); he wrote down the *Vaudoux* assembly and filed it under superstition (Module 4). He sat on the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français. And in 1789 he went into the Club Massiac, the planters' lobby at Paris, and worked to prevent any reform of the system he had spent his life documenting. **The colony's archive and the colony's lobby were the same man.** No study of a seam will find a cleaner specimen: the person who *knew* the most was the person paid to explain it to the metropole.

Beside him: Pierre-Victor Malouet, planter and future deputy, who published a memoir defending slavery in 1788. Hilliard d'Auberteuil, whose *Considérations* on the colony had appeared a decade earlier. The *chambres d'agriculture*, which — Module 5 showed — mobilised in 1788 to save Nicolas Le Jeune. The Colonial Committee formed at Paris in July 1788 under Gouy d'Arsy, an absentee who had never set foot in the colony. And behind all of them, the merchant houses of Nantes, Bordeaux, and Le Havre, whose ships carried both the sugar and the story.

The **inflow valve** they operated is the robe of Module 3, pointed at its true audience. *La perle des Antilles.* The colony as the indispensable engine of French power. The *Code Noir* as proof that the King protected even his slaves. The genial ethnography of a contented people who danced. And it worked — for a century, France believed roughly what the colony told it, and the small number of Frenchmen who knew better wrote books that changed nothing (Module 3).

And note the one piece of information the colony *did* generate systematically about the enslaved, because the irony is exact. The colony had a press. The *Affiches Américaines* appeared week after week at Cap-Français, and it carried, master by master, name by name, the notices of the runaways (Module 1). **The only regular,**

printed, public record the order produced concerning the half-million people beneath it was a list of the ones who had left.

The outflow valve, and how it failed

Now the suppression apparatus, with its dates and its documents, because it is one of the best-recorded in the corpus and it did not work.

The *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes* — the book Module 3 quoted for the prophecy of the Black Spartacus — was banned in France in 1772, placed on the Index by the clergy in 1774, and suppressed by an *arrêt du Conseil* on 19 December 1779. Then, on 25 May 1781, the Parlement of Paris condemned the third edition to be *lacérée et brûlée* by the executioner of high justice, as an *«ouvrage impie, blasphématoire, séditieux, tendant à soulever et à renverser les principes fondamentaux de l'ordre civil»* — an impious, blasphemous, seditious work, tending to raise up and to overturn the fundamental principles of the civil order. Raynal was *décrété de prise de corps* — an arrest warrant issued against his person — and fled. He spent 1781 to 1784 in Belgium, Germany and Switzerland, returned to France barred from the capital, lived at Toulon and then Marseille, and did not come back to the region of Paris until the National Assembly quashed the Parlement's warrant on 15 August 1791.

That is the full weight of an *ancien régime* state falling on a book. And here is what it achieved.

The Parlement's judgment ran to fourteen pages, was printed by the Parlement's own printer — and **quoted the condemned book at length**, so that the *arrêt* itself became a vehicle for the text. The *Histoire des deux Indes* went through more than thirty editions in France between 1770 and 1787 and more than fifty abroad; it was abridged into a *Potted Raynal* and a *Children's Raynal*; Napoleon carried it to Egypt; and Toussaint Louverture read it, and was struck above all by the passage that prophesied a slave revolution in the West Indies. The condemnation did not suppress the book. **The condemnation sold it.**

The corpus should carry this as a refinement, and it is not a paradox but a mechanism. **Where the trusted-information position is *crowded* rather than captured — where a court must publish its reasons, and a book trade runs across borders that no single sovereign controls — the outflow valve leaks by its own operation.**

A suppression that must be *justified in public* is an advertisement. The seam of Saint-Domingue was held by the Atlantic, not by the censor, and the censor's failure in Paris was of no consequence for a century precisely *because* the Atlantic was doing the work. Which is why the censorship record here is a record of noisy, expensive, and completely irrelevant defeats.

And one honest complication, which this study should carry rather than smooth away. Raynal was not the book. Diderot wrote the Spartacus passage and perhaps a third of the whole. Raynal himself put his name, in 1785, to an *Essai sur l'administration de Saint-Domingue* that justified colonisation and slavery on economic and moral grounds — a text Malouet later claimed. And on 31 May 1791 Raynal addressed the National Assembly to condemn revolutionary ideas and revolutionary violence, to the fury of the deputies who had honoured him, until Robespierre rescued him as a respectable old man manipulated by the enemies of the Revolution. **The most famous anti-slavery book of the eighteenth century was published under the name of a man who defended slavery.** That is not a curiosity. It is a fact *about the seam*: the metropole's information about its own colonies was so unreliable that its greatest indictment of them was signed by an apologist.

The cheapest suppression in the corpus

The Field Manual notes, almost in passing, that the outflow valve can be worked most cheaply of all by leaving the alternative simply untaught. Saint-Domingue is the limit case of that sentence, and it deserves to be stated plainly.

The colony spent nothing whatever on censoring the enslaved, because it had already made them unreachable. There was no book to ban, because they could not read. There was no heretic to silence, because there was no authorised doctrine for him to depart from. There was no rival press to close, because there was no press. The order had, at a stroke, in 1763, achieved a completeness of information control over four hundred and sixty-five thousand people that no inquisition in this corpus ever approached — and it had done so *by abolishing the channel entirely*.

It is the cheapest suppression in the collection. It cost one shipload of Jesuits.

And it is the most expensive mistake in the collection, and the rest of this module is the bill.

When the sovereign became an argument

For a hundred years, France spoke to Saint-Domingue in one voice: the King's, privately, in despatches, to a governor and an intendant. Under those conditions a colonial administration can filter perfectly, because there is only one channel and it holds both ends of it.

In 1789 that stopped.

The framework's colonial prediction is that the order's core task is keeping the two ends of the seam from meeting. What broke Saint-Domingue's seam was not that a truth got through from the abolitionists — Module 3 proved that abolitionist truth, published at full volume for forty years, moved nothing. **What broke the seam was that the metropole started conducting its government in public.**

A National Assembly debates in the open and prints its debates. It passes decrees which are law, and which must therefore be promulgated in the colony, because a colonial administration cannot suppress the law of its own sovereign. And a fracturing metropole passes *contradictory* decrees, in sequence, and prints those too.

Watch the sequence, because it is the seam tearing:

On 8 March 1790, on Barnave's report, the colonies were made a case apart — *spécialité* — and the Assembly's colonial committee proposed, in the same breath, to exempt the colonies from the constitution **and to prosecute anyone who attempted to spark uprisings against the slave system.** The metropolitan legislature had taken over the colony's outflow valve and legislated it.

On 15 May 1791, under pressure from Grégoire and others, the Assembly granted political rights to free men of colour born of free parents. On 24 September 1791 it rescinded them. On 28 March 1792 it restored them.

And on 8 June 1791, the abbé Grégoire — a deputy of the National Assembly — printed at Paris a *Lettre aux citoyens de couleur et nègres libres de Saint-Domingue*, addressed directly, over the heads of the colonial government, to the excluded caste of a French colony. He told them they had been men and were now citizens; that the decree was not a favour, since a favour is a privilege and a privilege is an injustice; and — this is the passage that matters here — that he had feared all along that a perverted interpretation would travesty the Assembly's decrees, and that when he had pressed the point, the colonial deputies had assured him the article covered the free coloured *in its generality*, and Barnave had at last admitted as much before the Assembly.

A member of the metropolitan legislature, in print, naming the seam and shipping the accusation to the far side of it.

No colonial administration can censor its own metropole. That is the refinement, and it is the structural key to this whole episode. The seam of a colonial order is held not by the colony's censorship but by the *metropole's silence* — by the fact that an absolutist state speaks once, quietly, through a single channel it owns. The moment the metropole becomes a public argument, the filter is worthless, because the thing that would have to be filtered is the sovereign's own law, printed, promulgated, and quoted back at the governor by the people it favours. And a metropole in revolution cannot stop talking.

What actually arrived

And now the last turn, which is the darkest thing in this module and the reason for its title.

What crossed the water in the end and did the work was not the Declaration of the Rights of Man. It was not Jaucourt, or Raynal, or Grégoire's letter, which was addressed to the free coloured and not to the enslaved and which the enslaved could not read.

It was a rumour. Through 1791 a *forged royal decree*, emancipating the enslaved, circulated in Saint-Domingue. And when the northern plain rose on the night of 22–23 August 1791, the leaders of the rising professed — and the record on this is consistent and is accepted across the historiography — that they were fighting **for the King of France**, who had freed them, and whose decree the colonial authorities were suppressing. They demanded their rights as Frenchmen, granted by their sovereign and withheld by their masters.

Read that with the framework's coldness, because it repays it.

They did not rise against the law. **They rose to enforce a law they believed was being hidden from them.** And they were entirely right about the hiding, and entirely wrong about the law.

A century of withholding had not produced ignorance. It had produced something far more combustible: a population that knew, with absolute and well-founded certainty, exactly *one* thing about the world across the water — **that its masters lied to it about what that world said.** Every enslaved person in Saint-Domin-

gue had a lifetime's evidence for that proposition and no evidence at all against it. And a population in that condition will disbelieve any truth its masters tell it, and will believe *anything* that arrives from the other side of the sea and flatters its hope.

The vacancy did not stay empty. Part 3b of the framework says it never does: *the trusted-information position is structural, and cannot be emptied — only occupied, crowded, or captured; a suppression that destroys one occupant clears the ground for another.* Saint-Domingue destroyed the occupant, thoroughly, in 1763, and congratulated itself on the economy. The position refilled — with the *oungan*, the *commandeur*, the coachman who drove his master to town and heard what was said there, the maroon on the road, and finally with a piece of paper that nobody could read and everybody believed.

The colony's information monopoly, once discovered, became the grievance. The seam itself was the *casus belli*.

Reading information and suppression against the framework

First: the suppression apparatus as a distribution channel. Where the interpreter position is crowded rather than captured — a Parlement that must publish its reasons, a book trade that outruns any one sovereign — the outflow valve leaks by its own operation, and a ban that must be justified in public is an advertisement. The Parlement of Paris burned the *Histoire des deux Indes* and printed it in the judgment.

Second: the cheapest outflow valve is an untaught population — and it is a loan, not a saving. An order that never taught its subjects need never censor them, and pays nothing for the silence. But it has purchased that silence by destroying its own capacity ever to be *believed* by them, and it has left a vacancy which anyone at all may fill, with anything at all. The saving is real, and it is booked immediately, and the interest accrues for a hundred years.

Third, and this is the module's contribution: the seam's failure mode is not exposure. It is forgery. State it generally, because it travels: *an order that has withheld information from a population for generations has, by that very act, manufactured the credibility of any counterfeit that later reaches them.* When the crisis comes, the ruled will not be moved by the truth — they have no reason to trust the mouth it comes out of — and they will be moved absolutely by a rumour that fits what they already know, which is that they are being lied to. **The seam does not break when the truth**

gets out. It breaks when a lie gets in, and the lie's authority is a debt the seam itself ran up.

Fourth: the colonial seam is held by the metropole's silence, not the colony's censorship. So long as the metropolitan sovereign speaks once, privately, down a channel the colonial administration owns at both ends, the filter is perfect and cheap. The moment the metropole becomes a *published argument* — a legislature that debates in the open, decides, reverses itself, and prints all of it — the filter is not merely weakened but *void*, because what would have to be censored is the law. No colonial government can suppress its own sovereign's statutes, and a metropole in revolution generates them faster than any packet-boat can carry them. **Look for a colony's seam to fail from the metropolitan end, and to fail suddenly.**

And the discipline, held. Nothing here says that the men who rose in August 1791 were dupes, and the framework does not require it. They acted on the best information available to a people from whom all information had been withheld, and they were right about the essential thing — that their masters were concealing something from them and had been doing so all their lives. That the specific decree was a forgery is a fact about *the colony's information architecture*, not about their judgement. **They were reasoning correctly from a world their masters had built.**

A note on sources. Primary quotations are public-domain and given as the sources reproducing them give them. The Parlement of Paris's condemnation of the *Histoire des deux Indes* — that it be *lacérée et brûlée* by the executioner of high justice as an *«ouvrage impie, blasphématoire, séditieux, tendant à soulever et à renverser les principes fondamentaux de l'ordre civil»* — is quoted from two independent reproductions of the *arrêt* (the *Arrest de la cour de Parlement qui condamne un imprimé…*, Paris, P. G. Simon, Imprimeur du Parlement, 1781), which agree. The date is given as 25 May 1781, which is the majority reading; some sources give 23 May, and one gives 29 May for the burning itself. The earlier stages of the suppression (banned 1772; placed on the Index by the clergy in 1774; suppressed by *arrêt du Conseil* of 19 December 1779) and the sequel (Raynal *décrété de prise de corps*, in exile 1781–84, barred from Paris, the warrant quashed by the National Assembly on 15 August 1791) are as the specialist literature on Raynal gives them and are paraphrased. That the *arrêt* reproduced substantial extracts of the condemned book, and that the condemnation increased its sale, is likewise from that literature. Raynal's 1785 *Essai sur l'administration de Saint-Domingue* and his *Adresse* to the National Assembly of 31 May 1791 are reported from the same source and are not quoted.

The abbé Grégoire's *Lettre aux citoyens de couleur et nègres libres de Saint-Domingue et des autres isles françoises de l'Amérique* (Paris, Imprimerie du Patriote Français, 1791), dated

8 June 1791, is reported here in indirect speech only. The text consulted was a modern English translation (Mitchell Abidor's, for the Marxists Internet Archive); the French original has *not* been verified for this module and no words are placed in Grégoire's mouth. The letter is a load-bearing document and the French should be recovered before compilation, since several of its phrases — on a favour being a privilege and a privilege an injustice, and on the fear that perverted interpretation would travesty the Assembly's decrees — would be worth quoting exactly if they can be confirmed.

The decrees are dated as the standard accounts date them: the decree of 8 March 1790 and the instructions of 28 March establishing *spécialité* and providing for the prosecution of those who would incite risings against the slave system; the decree of 15 May 1791 granting political rights to free men of colour born of free parents; its rescission on 24 September 1791; and its restoration on 28 March 1792. The Club Massiac (founded at Paris in August 1789) and the Colonial Committee (July 1788, under Gouy d'Arsy) are as the standard accounts give them. Moreau de Saint-Méry's membership of the Club Massiac is reported from the French colonial-history literature and is paraphrased; it is the pivot of this module's argument and is worth further verification. Malouet's 1788 memoir in defence of slavery is reported and not quoted. The letter of an unnamed colonial delegate of 12 August 1789 complaining of the Société des Amis des Noirs was consulted only in English translation in a secondary source and is **not** quoted here.

The forged royal decree circulating in Saint-Domingue in 1791, and the professed royalism of the leaders of the August rising — their claim to be fighting for a King who had freed them and whose decree the colonial authorities were suppressing — are reported from the standard accounts of the revolution (Fick, Dubois, Geggus) and are paraphrased. This is the module's central factual claim and it is well attested; but it is a claim about what the rebels *said and were reported to have said*, and it should be read as such. The Bois Caïman ceremony of August 1791 is again **not** relied upon here, for the reasons entered in Module 4; its historicity is disputed and it belongs to Module 10.

The remark attributed to Mirabeau, that the whites of Saint-Domingue slept at the foot of Vesuvius, is widely quoted, has not been verified against a French source for this module, and is therefore **not** used above.

RED POMPONS AND WHITE

Module 8 · Elite Coordination and the Default — an apex held together by no code, no creed and no shared formation, but by a ratio; France's Divide-and-balance machine, which worked for a century and failed in an afternoon; two overproduced claimant classes with nowhere to go, one of whose exits the crown had sealed by law in 1777; and a governor who, losing his colonists, armed the caste they had spent sixty years insulting

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The default was a number

The framework's first question here is whether the order reproduced *by default* — each beneficiary defending the whole simply by defending his own position, needing no cabal, no conspiracy, and no meeting. In Saint-Domingue it did, more completely than in any other case in this collection, and the mechanism can be stated in four words.

Fifteen to one.

Somewhere between twenty-eight and forty thousand whites; between four hundred and sixty-five and five hundred thousand enslaved. Every white person in the colony — the sugar baron with four hundred people in his *ateliers*, the *procureur* running an absentee's estate, the shopkeeper in Cap-Français, the drunk sailor on the quay — knew that arithmetic in his bones, and knew what it meant. It meant that if the floor failed, he died. It did not matter what he thought of the man beside him. It did not matter that the *petit blanc* hated the *grand blanc* who would not have him at table, or that the Creole despised the metropolitan, or that the planter loathed the merchant who held his paper. Against the ratio, all of that was noise.

Now compare this apex with the others in the corpus, because the comparison is the finding.

Buganda's chiefs were bound by a kingship whose sacred claim they had all been formed in. China's officials were bound by a shared classical formation and an

examination that made them recognise one another. The Ottoman household was bound by a code of service and a common origin outside the population it ruled. The Vietnamese mandarinate was bound by a Confucian doctrine which its members genuinely believed. In every case the coordinating mechanism has *positive content* — a creed, a code, a formation, an ancestor-cult, something the elite holds in common that is *about something*.

The whites of Saint-Domingue held nothing in common except a threat. There was no colonial creed. There was no shared formation — the *grands blancs* were educated in France and the *petits blancs* were not educated at all. There was no code of service, no ancestor-cult, no order of chivalry, and — Module 3 established it — no robe that anyone in the colony seriously believed. There was a ratio, and the ratio was enough.

Apply the framework's revealed-preference test and the reading is clean. This apex, holding uncontested force, **spent nothing whatever on elite ideology**, because it did not need to. The arithmetic did the work of a religion, for free, every hour of every day, and it never once had to be preached.

Call it the **default of fear**, and note its two properties, because they are the whole of this module. It is *perfectly reliable* — it held for a hundred years without a single serious colonial rebellion, through wars, famines, bankruptcies and a poison panic. And it is *wholly non-adjudicative* — **a threat held in common cannot settle a quarrel among the people who hold it.** It tells them what will happen if they lose. It cannot tell them which of them is right.

What France actually ran

Now the mechanism the metropole operated on its colonial elite, classified against the Menu with the evidence stated, as Module 8 requires.

Divide and balance, as the primary family. Saint-Domingue was governed by two officers, deliberately set against each other: a **governor-general**, holding the military authority, and an **intendant**, holding the fiscal and civil authority — each reporting separately to Versailles, each with standing to check the other, neither able to act alone. The judicial power sat not in one court but in **two Conseils supérieurs**, at Cap-Français and at Port-au-Prince. The territory itself was divided into **three**

provinces — North, West and South — with no unified body of any kind above them. At every level, and on purpose, no single hand could close on the colony.

Institutional prevention, as the second. The Field Manual's *Prevent* family is defined by outsider recruitment — the *devshirme* — and Saint-Domingue does not run that. But it runs the same logic against the *institution* rather than the person, and the corpus should note the variant: **France simply refused to let its colonial elite have a coordinating body at all.** There was no colonial assembly in Saint-Domingue. In 1787 Martinique and Guadeloupe were granted the right to establish one; **Saint-Domingue was excluded**. And in the same period, when the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français refused to register a royal ordinance — the one that protected metropolitan creditors against colonial debtors and, in the same breath, restricted the mistreatment of the enslaved (Module 6) — Versailles simply **abolished the court**, in January 1787, and moved its powers to Port-au-Prince.

Co-optation by debt, as the third. The *exclusif* bound every planter's crop to a French port, and the credit chain bound him personally: the merchant houses of Nantes and Bordeaux financed his estate, sold him his workforce, and held his paper. A planter who defied France defied his own bank.

And this blend worked. That is the part that must be said plainly, because it is the most instructive fact in the module. For a century the planters of Saint-Domingue grumbled about the *exclusif*, smuggled around it, and did not rebel. Across the water, Britain gave her North American colonists elected assemblies — and they used them to coordinate, to correspond, and finally to secede. **France denied her planters the institution Britain granted, and France's planters stayed.** The Menu is not an abstraction; it was tested against a control group in the same ocean in the same generation, and the French answer held.

The Field Manual notes that *Divide and balance* is "named with real instances but not yet run as a full case here; flagged for a future study." **This is that case**, and what follows is its post-mortem.

Two overproductions, and no door

The framework then asks whether the elite is overproducing claimants, and — crucially — what outlet was open for the surplus in that generation. Saint-Domingue was overproducing at *two ends simultaneously*, and both outlets were shut.

The first overproduction was France's, and Saint-Domingue was where it landed.

This is worth stating carefully, because it inverts the Menu's own frame. The Field Manual reads *Export* as the discharge of elite overproduction: let the surplus form, and send it outward, "to a frontier, a holy war, a colonial service, anywhere the ambition can be spent on someone other than the men who hold the land at home." Saint-Domingue *is* that anywhere. The *petits blancs* — the artisans, overseers, clerks, tavern-keepers, sailors, adventurers, bankrupts and disappointed younger sons who made up the bulk of the white population — are French elite overproduction, physically relocated across three thousand miles of water.

And a colony is the **end of the line.** There is no further frontier. You cannot export a *petit blanc* out of Saint-Domingue; there is nowhere to send him. He arrives with the expectations of a European gentleman and finds himself, in a society whose entire wealth is already owned, holding one asset only: his colour (Module 2). And he defends that asset with a ferocity nobody who owns anything else can match.

The second overproduction was the colony's own, and it manufactured it deliberately, in bed.

The *gens de couleur libres* were produced at a steady rate by the sexual economy of the plantation — the children of white planters by enslaved women, freed, sometimes acknowledged, often educated, frequently endowed with land and slaves. By 1789 there were twenty to thirty thousand of them, holding a quarter to a third of the colony's enslaved, manning the whole of the *maréchaussée* and two-thirds of the militia (Module 1). They were, by every material measure that matters to the framework, **an elite** — capable, propertied, armed, trained, and formed.

And Module 2 showed what the settlement did with them. It did not seat them. It moved the marker of inclusion off a status they could acquire and onto a substance they could not, and then built a science to survey the new boundary. **The colony trained a counter-elite and legislated it out of every chair.**

And then it sealed the door.

Here is the connection this study has been building toward since Module 2, and it deserves to be stated as sharply as the evidence allows. There was exactly one outlet for an ambitious free man of colour in Saint-Domingue, and it was *France*: to go to the metropole, to be educated there, to take a commission, to trade, to be — for a while

— simply a man with money in a country that had not yet decided to hate him. Julien Raimond went. Vincent Ogé went.

On **9 August 1777**, the *Déclaration du roi pour la police des Noirs* forbade any "Noir, Mulâtre, ou autres Gens de couleur" to enter the kingdom of France.

The crown closed the only outlet its colonial counter-elite possessed, **twelve years before the fracture**, for the drafting reasons Module 2 identified — because a law about a colour would pass a Parlement that would not register a law about slaves.

The Field Manual is explicit that overproduction is *pressure, not a verdict*: "Where a legitimate outlet is at hand that generation... the pressure discharges *outward*, and an order can carry a dangerous overproduction rate for centuries without fracturing. Where no outlet exists or it matures too slowly, the identical pressure discharges *inward*, and that inward turn is fracture."

Saint-Domingue, in 1789, held two overproduced claimant classes and had no outlet for either. It was the terminus of one export chain and it had legislated shut the other. There was nowhere for the pressure to go but inward, and inward is where it went.

Red pompons and white

The fracture, dated, because Module 8 must show the default breaking and Module 10 must inherit a sequence.

The colonists expelled the intendant in 1789. The metropole, on **6 March 1790**, decreed the convocation of a colonial assembly — and the decree is a study in itself: it excluded colonists resident in France, it excluded the free people of colour, it excluded the agents of government, **and it did not fix the limits of the assembly's powers.** Paris, fracturing, handed its colonial elite the one institution it had withheld for a century, gave it to the narrowest possible faction, and forgot to say what it could do.

On **27 February 1790** three provincial assemblies were elected, North, West and South, all-white. In late March and April the deputies gathered at Saint-Marc — two hundred and twelve of them, eighty from the North, seventy-four from the West, fifty-eight from the South — under the presidency of Thomas Millet, with lawyers dominating the debates. And the assembly split *along the line of the debt*.

Beaubrun Ardouin, the great nineteenth-century Haitian historian, saw the fault exactly, and the modern scholarship has not improved on him. The planters who

dominated at Saint-Marc wanted absolute independence, and their motives were three: **the excess of their debts to the national commerce, the hope of escaping them, and the desire to shake off the monopoly.** The northern assembly, meanwhile — composed in part of men of law, government officers, and *merchants* — preferred to remain legalist, content that the colonial legislature should be free of the National Assembly provided Saint-Domingue stayed attached to France.

Read that and the character of the fracture is unmistakable. **It was the debtors' party against the creditors' party.** Module 6's upper extraction — the *exclusif* and the credit chain — did not merely make the planters resentful. It supplied the fault along which the colonial elite cracked the moment the arbiter above them faltered.

The sequence then runs fast:

28 May 1790 — the Assembly of Saint-Marc publishes its own constitutional bases, declaring its legislature independent of the National Assembly. **30 June 1790** — loyalist troops attack the Western Assembly. **20 July 1790** — Saint-Marc opens the colony's ports to foreign trade, in open defiance of the *exclusif*. **Night of 29–30 July 1790** — Governor Peynier disperses the assembly by force. **7–9 August 1790** — eighty-five of the two hundred and twelve deputies seize the government ship *Le Léopard*, suborn her crew into mutiny, and sail for France to demand justice of the National Assembly. They are the *Léopardins*, the *Faction des 85*. They reach Brest on 14 September. **11–12 October 1790** — Barnave reports to the National Assembly, which dissolves the Assembly of Saint-Marc, annuls its acts, and **congratulates those who took up arms against it.**

And through all of it the whites of Saint-Domingue sorted themselves by the colour of a pin. The partisans of the assembly wore red pompons; the partisans of the governor and of Colonel Mauduit du Plessis — commander of the Port-au-Prince regiment, a hero of the American war — wore white. The colony's factions had names before they had programmes: *crochus* and *bossus*, red pompons and white.

Thirty thousand Europeans, standing on half a million people, identifying themselves to one another by a scrap of ribbon on a shirt pocket, and shooting at each other in the streets of Port-au-Prince.

That is what a default of fear looks like on the day it fails. The ratio was still fifteen to one. It had simply stopped mattering, because the whites had found something they feared more than the enslaved: **each other.**

The governor arms the excluded

And now the moment at which Module 8 becomes *Elite Chaos*, and it should be read slowly, because the framework says this is how orders actually change and here it is happening in front of us, in a dated document, done deliberately, by a named man.

Governor Peynier was losing. The colonists had defied him, seized a warship, and gone to Paris. His troops were unreliable — the regiments of Artois and Normandy had been worked on by the Léopardins before they sailed. He held the King's commission and almost nothing else.

So he turned to the free people of colour.

Ardouin's analysis is exact and this study cannot better it: Peynier felt the necessity of some accommodation towards the class of men of colour, whose numbers balanced those of the whites, and who ought, *by policy*, to embrace the party of the colonial government — because in helping to maintain the colony's dependence on France, they might hope for the recognition of their rights from the National Assembly, whereas they had nothing whatever to expect from the colonists, whose hatred of them had only grown since the Revolution began. And Ardouin's verdict on the consequence is the sentence this module has been walking toward: **without them, Saint-Domingue would have escaped its metropole entirely.**

Set it down as plainly as it deserves. **The royal government of a slave colony, defeated by its own white settlers, armed the caste those settlers had spent sixty years legislating into the dirt.** Not as a concession to justice, and not because anyone in Versailles had read Jaucourt. As *policy* — because it needed bodies, and there was only one place left to get them.

And the whites, split into two armed factions, spent 1790 and 1791 accusing each other of precisely the crime the framework predicts: the "patriots" charged the "royalists" with inciting the enslaved in order to destroy their opponents' fortunes, and the royalists were charged with wanting a rising so that they might restore order over its ashes. **Each faction told the truth about the other.**

Elite Chaos says structural change comes when the floor cracks from above, and that the commonest way it cracks is that the elite fractures and arms the people against itself. This is not an analogy to that proposition. It is the proposition, occurring, in Saint-Domingue, between February 1790 and August 1791, before a single plantation had been burned.

Reading elite coordination against the framework

First: the default of fear — an apex bound by a threat rather than a code. Add it to the corpus as a type, because Saint-Domingue is its cleanest specimen and the type has a signature. Where an elite holds *no* positive coordinating content — no creed, no shared formation, no code of service, no ancestor-cult — but sits on a catastrophic ratio, the default will hold with extraordinary reliability, cost nothing, and require no cabal. And it will possess one fatal property: **it cannot adjudicate.** A threat held in common tells its holders what happens if they lose; it cannot tell them which of them is right. So such an order survives every external pressure and cannot survive its first serious internal question. Look for it, and expect a century of quiet followed by a single year of ruin.

Second: Divide-and-balance, run as a case, and its failure mode named. The Field Manual flagged this family as unrun. Saint-Domingue runs it: governor against intendant, two sovereign councils, three provinces, and no colonial assembly at all — against a British control group across the water whose assemblies let its colonists coordinate their way to secession. The French machine worked, and it worked for a hundred years.

And then it failed in a way none of the other four families fail. **Export corrodes when the outlet closes. Prevent corrodes when the anti-hereditary mechanism decays into heredity. Rotate corrodes when wealth re-entrenches through the very exam meant to prevent it. All three fail *slowly*, over generations, and give warning. Divide-and-balance does not corrode at all — and then it fails in an afternoon.**

The reason is structural and it should be stated as a law. **Divide-and-balance is the only Menu family that requires a live arbiter.** Governor and intendant check each other *only because Versailles stands behind both*. Three provinces balance *only because a single crown ranks above them*. The arbiter is not a party to the balance; he is its precondition. Remove him — and Paris removed itself in 1789, not by intention but by fracturing — and the balance does not relax into unity. **It collapses instantly into civil war, and it collapses worse than an undivided order would, because the order has spent a century deliberately manufacturing, funding, and institutionalising the factions that will now fight each other.** A Divide-and-balance order does not merely lose its cohesion when the arbiter goes. It inherits, fully formed, the enemies it built.

Third: Export relocates the pressure; it does not discharge it. The Field Manual reads Export as a discharge — ambition spent "on someone other than the men who hold the land at home." True, and true at the metropole. But the surplus *lands somewhere*, and the somewhere is a society with the identical open problem and no onward frontier. **The terminus of an export chain accumulates every claimant the chain ever moved, and has nowhere to pass them on.** Read the empire whole and Export is not a solution to elite overproduction but a *deferral with a destination* — and the destination pays.

Fourth: an order that manufactures a counter-elite and then seals its exit has chosen fracture. Saint-Domingue produced the *gens de couleur libres* by its own daily operation, denied them every chair by the moving marker of Module 2, and then — by the *Police des Noirs* of 9 August 1777 — closed the single door through which their ambition could have left the colony. The Field Manual's own rule then applies mechanically: no outlet, therefore the pressure turns inward, therefore fracture. It took twelve years.

Fifth, and handing to Module 9: this apex did not hold three monopolies. Violence was executed on the ground by the free coloured. Wealth was shared with them, to the tune of a quarter or a third. Trusted information was held by a lobby three thousand miles away in an hôtel in Paris. What the whites of Saint-Domingue actually monopolised was **the law** — the right to say who counted — and that was all. An apex holding one leg of the tripod and leasing out the other two is not a coalition. It is a claim, and Module 9 will watch men walk up to it with the metropole's own decree in their hands and ask it to make good.

A note on sources. This module quotes no primary text directly and rests on paraphrased scholarship, dated decrees, and one nineteenth-century historian; the flags are correspondingly detailed.

The dual structure of colonial government (governor-general and intendant), the two Conseils supérieurs at Cap-Français and Port-au-Prince, and the three provinces are as the standard accounts of French colonial administration give them. The exclusion of Saint-Domingue from the grant of colonial assemblies to Martinique and Guadeloupe in 1787, and the abolition of the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français by Versailles in January 1787 after it refused to register the royal ordinance, are reported from the standard accounts and were flagged in Module 6 for verification here; they are given as reported and would repay confirmation against the *Archives parlementaires* and the colonial correspondence before compilation, since the "institutional Prevent" classification rests on them.

The fracture sequence of 1790 follows the specialist literature and the nineteenth-century Haitian historiography, and the dates are given as those sources give them: the decree of 6 March 1790 convoking a colonial assembly and excluding colonists resident in France, free people of colour, and government agents; the election of the three provincial assemblies on 27 February 1790; the gathering at Saint-Marc from late March, with 212 deputies (80 North, 74 West, 58 South) under Thomas Millet; the constitutional bases of 28 May 1790; the attack on the Western Assembly of 30 June; the opening of the ports on 20 July; the dispersal of the assembly on the night of 29–30 July by Governor Antoine de Thomassin de Peynier; the seizure of *Le Léopard* by eighty-five deputies on 7–9 August and their arrival at Brest on 14 September; and Barnave's report of 11–12 October 1790, on which the National Assembly dissolved the assembly, annulled its acts, and commended those who had taken arms against it. The factional names — *crochus* and *bossus*, *pompons rouges* and *pompons blancs* — are reported from these sources; the pompon colours are attested in the reference literature but have not been traced to a contemporary document for this module, and the detail, though vivid and load-bearing for the title, is flagged accordingly.

Beaubrun Ardouin's *Études sur l'histoire d'Haïti* (1853–60) is in the public domain and is used here as a historian, paraphrased and credited rather than quoted. His two judgements relied upon — that the Saint-Marc planters sought independence because of the excess of their debts to the national commerce, the hope of escaping them, and the wish to throw off the monopoly; and that Governor Peynier turned to the free men of colour as a matter of policy, since they could hope for their rights from the National Assembly and had nothing to expect from the colonists — are his analysis, written sixty years after the events and by a partisan of the free coloured elite, and should be read as such. His verdict that without them Saint-Domingue would have escaped its metropole entirely is his, not this study's, and is given as his. The modern scholarship is consistent with him on the substance.

The mutual accusation between the white factions — each charging the other with the crime of arming the enslaved — is paraphrased from the modern French scholarship on the 1791 insurrection and is not quoted. The expulsion of the intendant in 1789 is reported from a single account and is stated with that caveat. Vincent Ogé's return, his letters to Peynier and to Chesneau, and his rising and execution belong to Module 9 and are deliberately not narrated here. The population

ranges are those established in Module 2. The *Déclaration du roi pour la police des Noirs* of 9 August 1777 is as quoted and sourced in Module 2.

THE SIDE OPPOSITE

Module 9 · Plurality or Foreclosure — an order that owned or outlawed every counterweight within it; a man who therefore crossed an ocean to find one, and came home with a decree and no bailiff; a creed turned back to the exact width of the turners' own exclusion, by men who owned slaves themselves; and a court which, sentencing him to be broken alive, took the trouble to specify which side of the square

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The inventory

The framework's question here is capture against contestability at the scale of the realm: are violence, wealth, and trusted information held by one hand, or genuinely separated into hands that can check one another? It asks for an inventory of the counterweights the apex does *not* own, each judged genuine or captured, and it asks *plural where* and *foreclosed where*, because an order can be plural at its core and foreclosed at its periphery.

Take the inventory of Saint-Domingue and it can be finished in a paragraph.

Courts. Two Conseils supérieurs, at Cap-Français and Port-au-Prince, staffed by and among the planters. Module 5 watched one of them acquit Nicolas Le Jeune on the best facts the colony would ever produce, twice. Module 8 watched Versailles abolish the other at will in January 1787 for refusing to register an ordinance. Not a counterweight; an organ, and a revocable one.

Press. The *Affiches Américaines*, licensed, appearing at Cap-Français, and carrying — as the only regular printed record the order produced concerning nine-tenths of its population — the notices of the runaways.

Independent classes. One candidate only: the *gens de couleur libres*. And Module 2 catalogued sixty years of legislation designed precisely to strip them of standing — the professions in 1764, assembly in 1765, their surnames in 1773, the titles *sieur* and *dame* in 1781, arms and gunpowder in 1783.

Associations. The *chambres d'agriculture*, which mobilised in 1788 to save a man who had burned two women to death. The Club Massiac, which was the apex's own lobby. And the colonial assemblies, which when they finally came in 1790 were all-white by the express terms of the decree that summoned them.

Rival faiths. A Church which had expelled its own reformers in 1763 for instructing the enslaved (Module 4). And Vodou, which was illegal.

Verdict: there was not one institution in Saint-Domingue that the apex did not either own or outlaw. It is the most completely foreclosed order in this collection, and it is not close.

Plural where, foreclosed where

And yet the framework's second question — *plural where?* — produces the most extraordinary answer in the corpus, and everything that follows depends on it.

The same sovereign held both.

By 1790, France had a free press, a legislature that debated in the open and printed what it said, competing political clubs, a book trade no censor could hold (Module 7 watched the Parlement of Paris burn Raynal and sell thirty editions of him), and a trusted-information position that was *crowded* — genuinely contested among Amis des Noirs and Club Massiac and a hundred pamphleteers. Whatever else it was, revolutionary France was one of the most plural political orders then existing on earth.

Three thousand miles away, under the same crown, lay the most foreclosed order this study has examined.

Look at the three monopolies at the scale of the realm and they were not held by one coalition at all. They were **split across an ocean.** Violence: exercised on the ground by the free coloured *maréchaussée*, held in law by the whites, and held in the last resort by the metropole's navy and regiments. Wealth: shared with the free coloured to the tune of a quarter or a third, and creditored by the merchant houses of Nantes and Bordeaux. Trusted information: held by a planter lobby which, from 1789, had to *compete for it in a free Parisian press*.

So the counterweight the free coloured of Saint-Domingue needed **existed.** It simply was not in Saint-Domingue.

Which is why Vincent Ogé got on a ship.

The man who went to find it

Vincent Ogé was born about 1755 at Dondon, in the North, a *quarteron libre* of a comfortable family. He was educated at Bordeaux, lived for years in France, and traded as a merchant. In Paris, at the Revolution, he was among the founders of the **Société des colons américains** — and the name repays a moment's attention, because they did not style themselves a race. They styled themselves *colonists*. Proprietors. Men with an interest in the colony's prosperity, asking for the vote they were entitled to as property-owners.

Jean-Baptiste Chavannes was born about 1748 at Grande-Rivière-du-Nord. He was a free man of colour, and in 1779 he had sailed to Savannah under the comte d'Estaing — one of the Chasseurs-Volontaires of Saint-Domingue, the free coloured companies whom Module 1 identified as the men the colony's own coercive apparatus had trained and blooded.

Neither man petitioned the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français. Why on earth would they? It had just acquitted Le Jeune.

They went to Paris, where the seam was crowded — and they won.

The **decree of 28 March 1790**, the instructions accompanying the decree of 8 March, granted the vote in the colonies to every free person aged twenty-five and upward who held property. On its face, that is the free coloured of Saint-Domingue enfranchised at a stroke.

And on its face is precisely where it stopped, because the words had been chosen so that it need not be.

The abbé Grégoire asked Barnave, the rapporteur, to state plainly whether the decree applied to men of colour. He got no answer. Module 7 quoted Grégoire's own account of the episode, and it is worth recalling here: a mass of deputies, planters among them, hastened to say that the article covered the free coloured *in its generality*; and Barnave admitted as much before the Assembly only after Grégoire had questioned him repeatedly; and Grégoire had feared all along that a perverted interpretation would travesty the Assembly's decrees.

The ambiguity was the concession to the planters. Paris granted the right in language that could be denied in the colony — and the framework should carry this as a general finding, because it is a structural property of every core that must satisfy a periphery it cannot coerce. **A centre that cannot enforce will concede in words rather than in fact, because words are free and enforcement is not.** And an

ambiguous concession, delivered into a foreclosed periphery, is read by the excluded as a right and by the local apex as a nullity — and both readings are correct.

The bailiff

On 23 October 1790 Ogé landed at Cap-Français from an American ship. He had gone by way of England and the United States, and he had brought arms.

He did not raise a standard. He wrote letters. He wrote to Peynier, the governor-general; to Chesneau, president of the provincial assembly of the North; and to Vincent, the provincial commander — summoning each of them to promulgate and to apply the decree. To Peynier he wrote:

«Quelle a été ma surprise, Monsieur, de voir à mon arrivée que vous n'aviez pas promulgué le décret [...] Ma profession de foi est de faire exécuter le décret que j'ai concouru à obtenir, de repousser la force par la force...»

What was my surprise, sir, to see on my arrival that you had not promulgated the decree. My profession of faith is to have executed the decree that I helped to obtain — to repel force by force.

Read that sentence with the framework's coldness, because it is not the sentence of a revolutionary and it was never meant to be. There is no new order in it. There is no appeal to nature, or to reason, or to the rights of man in the abstract. **There is a law, and there is an official who is not applying it, and there is a man who intends to see it applied.** Ogé is not calling for the overthrow of anything. He is *serving process*. He has a warrant from the sovereign and no bailiff to execute it, so he has become the bailiff.

And that is this module's central contribution. Where an order is foreclosed at the periphery but plural at the core, the excluded do not petition locally — there is nothing to petition. **They travel.** And what they carry home is not a doctrine but a *warrant*. And an unenforced warrant is the most dangerous document a foreclosed order can ever receive, because it does three things in one stroke: it tells the excluded that they are *right*; it tells them that their local rulers are *lawless*; and it converts their violence from rebellion into **enforcement** — which is the only kind of violence that spreads, because it does not have to argue for itself.

Hold that beside Module 7's finding and the study's spine snaps into place. The enslaved of the northern plain rose in August 1791 in the belief that the King had

freed them and that their masters were concealing the decree. Ogé rose in October 1790 because the National Assembly *had* granted the right and the governor was refusing to promulgate the decree.

Ogé's decree was real. Theirs was forged. The structure was identical. Both risings were men enforcing a law they believed the colony was defying. That is not coincidence. It is what a hundred years of foreclosure does to a population's relationship with paper that arrives from across the water.

The exact width of the creed

Now the hard thing, and the framework requires that it be said without either condemnation or excuse.

Ogé did not ask for the enslaved. He said so, in writing, in his own submission to the colony's authorities:

«Je ne comprends pas dans mes réclamations le sort des nègres qui vivent dans l'esclavage.»

I do not include in my claims the fate of the negroes who live in slavery.

He owned slaves. Julien Raimond, who carried the caste's case in Paris, owned slaves. The free people of colour of Saint-Domingue owned between a quarter and a third of the enslaved population of the colony (Module 2), and manned the whole of the force that hunted them (Module 1). Grégoire's open letter of 8 June 1791 was addressed to the *citoyens de couleur et nègres libres* — the free — and not to the four hundred and sixty-five thousand who were not. And the organisation Ogé helped to found in Paris called itself the Society of American **Colonists**.

Read this as position logic and not as hypocrisy, because that is what it is. Their exclusion was racial; it was not chattel. They were proprietors barred from the vote, not property barred from personhood. They pressed the grievance their position gave them, at the width their position gave it, and they pressed no other — and if that seems shabby, it is worth noticing that it is exactly what every excluded class in this corpus has done, in every century, on every continent.

The refinement, then, stated generally: an excluded class turns the order's creed back to the exact width of its own exclusion, and not one inch further — because the creed is not its motive. Its position is. The creed is the instrument that happened to be lying there. It is picked up at the size of the hand that picks it up.

And now the corollary, which is far larger, and which the whites of Saint-Domingue understood perfectly well.

The free coloured could not *hold* the creed at their own width. Once Ogé had established in public, with a decree in his hand and an armed company at his back, that the metropole's law bound the colony, the only question remaining was who counted as a man. And the metropole had already answered that question, on 26 August 1789, in five words that everybody in the Atlantic world could recite: *les hommes naissent et demeurent libres et égaux en droits.*

The free coloured of Saint-Domingue opened a door they fully intended to walk through alone, and they could not close it behind them.

This is the deepest reason a foreclosed order cannot make a *limited* concession safely, and it is the framework's answer to a question that looks, from outside, like pure malice. When the whites refused to seat a caste that owned slaves, hunted maroons, paid taxes, and had every material reason to defend slavery to the last — a caste that was, on any rational accounting, their natural ally — they were not simply being stupid. **They were right about the mechanism.** A universal creed admitted to bind the colony at all cannot be admitted only partway, because the limit is not in the creed's gift. They saw that clearly, and it is the one thing in this whole story they got right, and it destroyed them anyway, because the alternative they chose was to break the man on a wheel.

The apex answers

On the night of 28 October 1790 Ogé and Chavannes moved through the plantations of the North with somewhere between two and three hundred armed men. The National Guard of Cap-Français came out against them under Borel, about fifteen hundred strong, and dispersed them in a night. Ogé, Chavannes and some thirty companions crossed into Spanish Santo Domingo.

The Spanish governor, Don Joaquín García, interrogated them himself from 23 November, and then handed them over. Ogé was delivered to the French on 5 January 1791.

The Spanish clerk's description of him, taken at Hinche on 20 November, survives: a man of five feet three inches, brown, with frizzy hair, an aquiline nose, large eyes, **and missing a tooth in the upper jaw**. Asked who he was, Ogé declared

himself a Frenchman, aged thirty-four, unmarried, of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion.

Module 1 quoted the *Encyclopédie*'s definition of a *pièce d'Inde*: sound, well made, not lame, *and with all his teeth*. Set the two descriptions side by side once, and then move on. The Atlantic world had one vocabulary for describing a man of African descent, and it did not much vary with his status.

He was tried before the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français, with commissioners appointed by the provincial assembly seated in the court to ensure that the accused did not escape. **Ogé asked for a defender. He was refused.**

And then the sentence, which this study will give at length, because it is a public document, because its exact wording is the evidence, and because there is one clause in it that is the whole of Module 9:

«Les dits Vincent Ogé jeune, quarteron libre de Dondon, et Jean-Baptiste Chavannes, quarteron libre de la Grande-Rivière, à être conduits par l'exécuteur de la haute justice au-devant de la principale porte de l'église paroissiale de cette ville, et là, nu-tête et en chemise, la corde au cou, à genoux, et ayant dans leurs mains chacun une torche de cire ardente du poids de deux livres, faire amende honorable, et déclarer à haute et intelligible voix que c'est méchamment, témérairement et comme malavisés, qu'ils ont commis les crimes dont ils sont convaincus, qu'ils s'en repentent et en demandent pardon à Dieu, au roi et à la justice ; ce fait, conduits sur la Place d'Armes de cette ville, au côté opposé à l'endroit destiné à l'exécution des Blancs, et d'y avoir les bras, jambes, cuisses et reins rompus vifs, sur un échafaud qui sera dressé à cet effet, et mis par l'exécuteur de la haute justice sur des roues, la face tournée vers le ciel, pour y rester tant qu'il plaira à Dieu de leur conserver la vie ; ce fait, leurs têtes coupées et exposées sur des poteaux...»

The said Vincent Ogé the younger, free *quarteron* of Dondon, and Jean-Baptiste Chavannes, free *quarteron* of Grande-Rivière, to be led by the executioner of high justice before the principal door of the parish church of this town, and there, bareheaded and in their shirts, a rope about their necks, on their knees, each holding in his hands a burning wax torch weighing two pounds, to make honourable amends, and to declare in a loud and intelligible voice that it is wickedly, rashly, and as ill-advised men that they have committed the crimes of which they are convicted, that they repent of them and ask pardon of God, of the King, and of justice; that done, to be conducted to the Place d'Armes of this town, **on the side opposite the place ap-**

pointed for the execution of Whites, and there to have their arms, legs, thighs and loins broken alive, upon a scaffold to be raised for that purpose, and to be placed by the executioner of high justice upon wheels, their faces turned to the sky, to remain there as long as it shall please God to preserve their lives; that done, their heads to be cut off and displayed upon posts.

Ogé's head on the highroad to Dondon. Chavannes's on the road to Grande-Rivière, opposite the Poisson estate. Their goods confiscated to the King. They were executed on 25 February 1791. Around forty death sentences were handed down in all; others went to the galleys for life.

The court, sentencing a man who had come home to demand that the law recognise no difference between him and a white man, took the trouble to specify which side of the square.

That is the sentence this entire module exists to set down. The Place d'Armes of Cap-Français had two execution grounds, and the caste line ran between them, and the Conseil supérieur — which had refused Ogé counsel — did not omit it from the judgment. **The colony would not concede the line even on the scaffold.** It surveyed the boundary of Module 2 onto the ground on which it killed him, in a legal instrument, in writing, as a formal term of the sentence of death.

Ogé and Chavannes were among the last men in the French world to be broken on the wheel. The *supplice de la roue* was abolished on 6 October 1791, seven months after they died on it.

What the repression bought

Then watch what the metropole did, because the sequence is the proof of everything above.

15 May 1791. News of the executions reaches Paris. The National Assembly, revolted, grants political rights to free men of colour — but only to those **born of free parents**, a group so narrow that the estimates run to a few hundred men in the whole colony. It is the smallest concession the Assembly could physically make.

The colonists refuse even that.

24 September 1791. The Assembly rescinds it.

4 April 1792. The Assembly grants full political equality.

At no point in that sequence did the metropole **enforce** anything.

And so every concession told the colony that the periphery could ignore the core with impunity; and every reversal told the excluded that the core could not be relied upon. **A concession that is not enforced is not a concession. It is an instruction in the apex's weakness, delivered simultaneously to the people who will defy it and the people who will be betrayed by it.**

Reading plurality against the framework

First: the counterweight existed, and it was three thousand miles away. Saint-Domingue is total foreclosure at the periphery under a sovereign that was, at its core, becoming one of the most plural orders in the world. The corpus should carry this pairing, because it is the colonial form of the *plural where / foreclosed where* question, and it has a consequence the others do not: the excluded of such an order have somewhere to go.

Second, and the module's contribution: the man with a warrant and no bailiff. Where the excluded can reach a plural core, they do not petition locally; they *travel*, and they come home carrying not a doctrine but a **warrant**. An unenforced warrant is the most dangerous document a foreclosed order can receive, because it converts rebellion into enforcement — and enforcement is the only kind of violence that does not have to justify itself. Ogé did not need to persuade anyone that his cause was right. He had it in writing, from the King's own Assembly. And the enslaved, ten months later, believed they had the same thing, and rose to enforce it, and the paper was a forgery, and it made no difference whatever to how they behaved. **The two risings had one structure, and the structure was legality.**

Third: a core that cannot enforce concedes in language. Barnave's silence when Grégoire asked him a direct question is the whole mechanism in one refusal. Where a centre must satisfy a periphery it cannot coerce, it will grant the right in words that permit the denial — because words are free and enforcement is not. And in a foreclosed periphery, the excluded read the words as a right, the apex reads them as a nullity, and **both are correct**, which is precisely why it ends in blood.

Fourth: the creed is turned back at the exact width of the turner's exclusion — and cannot be held there. Ogé excluded the enslaved from his claim, in writing, because he was a proprietor with a racial grievance and not a slave with a human one. That is position logic, and the framework predicts it, and the corpus should stop

being surprised by it. But a universal creed, once admitted to bind an order at all, cannot be admitted only partway, because the limit is not in the creed's gift. **The free coloured opened a door they meant to walk through alone, and could not close it behind them.** The whites saw that. It is the one thing they saw clearly, and they answered it with a wheel.

And fifth, the guardrail — because everything above can be misread, and this study exists to refuse that reading.

Ogé's rising failed. It failed for the same reason Makandal's failed in 1758: **the floor was intact.** Two or three hundred men met fifteen hundred of the National Guard and were dispersed in a single night. The free coloured of the West and South did not rise with him. The enslaved did not rise at all. A foreign governor extradited him. A court refused him counsel. And the colony broke him alive on a wheel, on the side of the square reserved for men like him, four months after he came home with the law in his hand.

Nothing about October 1790 was different from January 1758 except the paper. The courage was the same, the organisation was better, the cause was legally unanswerable — and the floor did not move an inch. What was different by August 1791 was not the creed, not the courage, and not the counterweights. **It was that the whites had begun shooting at each other, and a governor had armed the excluded** (Module 8). The Field Manual's caveat is exact and this module has just demonstrated it: pressure stores until it ruptures *only in the sense that it waits for the floor to crack from above*.

Module 10 will show the crack. Module 9 has shown, in the most literal way this study can offer, what the floor does to a man who pushes on it before the crack arrives.

A note on sources. The sentence of the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français against Ogé and Chavannes is quoted from Beaubrun Ardouin's *Études sur l'histoire d'Haïti* (1853–60), which is in the public domain and reproduces the judgment, and is cross-checked against two independent reproductions of the trial extract, which agree in substance and differ only in the passages each elects to give. The clause on which this module turns — *«au côté opposé à l'endroit destiné à l'exécution des Blancs»* — appears in all of them. The judgment has not been consulted in the original registers, and should be before compilation, since it is the study's single most important quoted document.

Ogé's letter to Governor Peynier is quoted from a scholarly reproduction citing the archives, not from the original; the wording should be checked. **His statement excluding the enslaved from his claims — *«Je ne comprends pas dans mes réclamations le sort des nègres qui vivent dans l'esclavage»* — is quoted from a single reproduction and is flagged accordingly.** The *substance* of the point is not in dispute anywhere in the literature: Ogé and the free coloured leadership sought equality with whites and explicitly did not seek emancipation, and they were themselves slaveholders. But the exact wording is load-bearing for the module's central argument and rests here on one source; it must be verified before compilation, and if it cannot be, the point should be made in indirect speech.

Dates and figures are given as the sources give them, with the disagreements noted. The execution is dated 25 February 1791, which is Ardouin's date and the majority reading; the Bibliothèque nationale's biographical notice and the Louverture Project give 6 February, and some accounts 26 February. Ogé's date of birth (c. 1755, at Dondon) and Chavannes's (c. 1748, at Grande-Rivière-du-Nord) are approximate. The size of Ogé's force is given as a range (two to three hundred; some accounts say "more than three hundred") and the National Guard of Le Cap as about fifteen hundred, as reported. The number of death sentences (around forty) is as reported. Chavannes's service at Savannah in 1779 under d'Estaing is reported from the French reference literature and, given its importance to the argument connecting this module to Module 1, deserves further verification. The Spanish *procès-verbal* taken at Hinche on 20 November 1790, with its description of Ogé, is reproduced in Ardouin's footnotes and is public domain.

The decree of 28 March 1790, Grégoire's unanswered question to Barnave, and the sequence of 15 May 1791 (rights to free men of colour born of free parents), 24 September 1791 (rescission), and 4 April 1792 (full equality) are dated as the standard accounts and the *Archives parlementaires* record them. The estimate that the 15 May decree covered only a few hundred men in the colony is as reported and is an estimate, not a count. The abolition of the *supplice de la roue* on 6 October 1791 is as reported.

Beaubrun Ardouin is used both as a source of public-domain documents and, where his judgement is invoked, as a historian — a nineteenth-century Haitian writing sixty years after the events and a partisan of the free coloured elite, and the reader should hold that. Modern scholarship (Garrigus, Dubois, Geggus, Fick) is consistent with him on the facts relied on here and is paraphrased where used.

A SINGLE MAN WHO HAS WORN THE EPAULETTE

Module 10 · Change and Collapse — Part I, the metropole coming apart, 1787–1804, before one word is written of the colony; Part II, the colony coming apart, 1791–1804; and the finding that the crack stayed open long enough for the fuel to become the fire

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

PART I · LANDSCAPE II — THE ORDER COMING APART

Metropolitan France, 1787–1804. Saint-Domingue does not appear in this section, and that is the point. By the time the colony is spoken of, the reader will already know where the decisive variable lived.

The debt

Landscape I established what the colony was for. Louis XIV, a post-crisis stabiliser who had put down his own nobility's civil war, built a fiscal-military machine to pay for the wars that machine existed to fight, and in 1674 an edict took Saint-Domingue *à notre domaine* — into the king's own estate, an instrument of revenue for a state that made war.

The machine worked. It worked for a hundred years. And then it did what such machines do.

France's last great venture was the American war. Between 1778 and 1783 the French crown financed the revolt of Britain's thirteen colonies, and financed it on borrowed money, out of a hatred for Britain that had been accumulating since Louis

XIV. It succeeded completely. Britain lost America. And the price, on the standard reckonings, was something on the order of a billion livres or more, added to a debt already built up over a century of continental war — until, by the late 1780s, the service of the debt alone was consuming somewhere around half of all the crown's revenue.

There was no way out except taxation, and taxation meant taxing the men who did not pay. Calonne, the Controller-General, understood this perfectly and proposed exactly that, and in February 1787 the crown convened an **Assembly of Notables** to secure the consent of the privileged orders to a universal land tax.

They refused. And the *parlements*, the sovereign courts, refused to register the reforms.

Read that with *Elite Chaos* open, because this is Skocpol's mechanism arriving on cue and on schedule. A revolutionary situation is not created by the masses deciding to revolt. It is created by a **crisis of the state** — most often a fiscal-military crisis driven by competition with rival powers abroad — which the old regime, locked into its own institutions, simply cannot resolve. And when the state visibly fails at the one thing a state exists to do, the consequence is felt not first below but **above**: the elite divides over what to do, and the unified monopoly of force that had made the order unbreakable comes apart at the top.

The floor of France cracked first as an accounting problem, and the refusal came from inside the apex.

The crown, beaten, summoned the Estates-General in August 1788, for May 1789.

The fracture

The Estates-General met at Versailles in May 1789 and deadlocked over voting by order or by head. On 17 June the Third Estate declared itself the National Assembly. On 20 June it swore not to disperse until it had given France a constitution. On 14 July the Bastille fell — and it fell in part because the French Guards, the crown's own troops in Paris, had gone over.

That is the first crack of *Elite Chaos*, arriving in the textbook form: **the apex split against itself, and one faction reached down and armed the common people as a**

weapon against the other. The crowd did not force the door. A faction of the elite, fighting a rival faction, opened it from the inside.

The counter-elite

And the men who walked through were exactly the men the framework says will walk through.

Maximilien Robespierre, a provincial advocate from Arras. Jacques-Pierre Brissot, a pamphleteer, the son of a caterer. Georges Danton, a lawyer. Jean-Paul Marat, a physician and journalist. Camille Desmoulins, a journalist. Behind them the whole Jacobin cadre — **a surplus of educated men with nowhere to rise**, formed to elite expectation by an order that had no chairs for them.

This is *Elite Chaos*'s fourth crack, and it is the engine beneath the first: an order seats fewer claimants than it breeds, and the thwarted near-elite — who have the education, the connections, the rhetorical and organisational skill, and above all a burning sense of a promised place denied — turn revolutionary and lead the common people as the fuel of their own war against the incumbents.

They did not make the crack. The debt made the crack. **They walked into it and took command of it**, which is what a counter-elite is for.

The creed released, and immediately uncontrollable

On 26 August 1789 the National Assembly declared that *les hommes naissent et demeurent libres et égaux en droits*.

Module 3 traced what that did to the colonial robe. Module 7 traced how it travelled. Module 9 traced the exact width to which it was turned back, and by whom, and what it cost them.

The colonial question, fought in Paris

And here the two halves of this study touch for the first time, and they touch **at the metropole**, among elites, years before anything detonated in the colony.

The Société des Amis des Noirs was founded at Paris in February 1788 — Brissot, Condorcet, Grégoire, Lafayette. The planters' Colonial Committee formed in July 1788 under Gouy d'Arsy, an absentee who had never seen the colony. The Club

Massiac was constituted at Paris in August 1789, and Moreau de Saint-Méry — the colony's own archivist and its own lawgiver — went into it.

And out of that quarrel came the decrees: 8 March 1790 and the instructions of 28 March; 15 May 1791; 24 September 1791; 4 April 1792. Granted, ambiguous, rescinded, restored.

The metropole's elite, fracturing, issued weapons. Module 9 showed a man carrying one of them home, in his hand, and being broken alive on a wheel for it.

The Republic fighting for its life

Then the metropole stopped merely fracturing and began to come apart.

20 April 1792: war on Austria. 10 August 1792: the monarchy overthrown. September 1792: the prison massacres. 21 September 1792: the Republic proclaimed. 21 January 1793: the King executed. February and March 1793: **war with Britain and with Spain** — and with that, every naval power in the Atlantic is at war with France, and the sea lanes to the Caribbean become a battlefield.

March 1793: the **Vendée** rises, and it is not a metaphor for civil war; it is a civil war, and it will kill somewhere between a hundred and two hundred thousand people. Summer 1793: the federalist revolts — Lyon, Marseille, Bordeaux. August 1793: **Toulon hands the French Mediterranean fleet to the British.** Then the Terror; then Thermidor in July 1794; then the Directory; then Brumaire in November 1799.

This is the condition of the metropole in the years the colony was lost, and it must be on the page before the losing is narrated. The floor of France was not cracked. It was shattered — from inside by fracture, from outside by great-power war, and from below by the very counter-elite the order had bred and failed to seat.

The thread, closed

And now put Landscape I and Landscape II side by side, because they are one argument.

The colony was created by the fiscal-military machine, to pay for wars. The wars produced the debt. The debt summoned the Estates-General. The Estates-General fractured the elite. And the fracture destroyed the colony.

Saint-Domingue was built by that machine and destroyed by the bankruptcy of the same machine, and **nobody in Saint-Domingue did either of those things.**

PART II · THE COLONY COMES APART

The rising

On the night of 22–23 August 1791 the plantations of the northern plain went up.

The men who led it were not the field gang, and the framework predicted that they would not be. They were **the slave elite**: Dutty Boukman, a coachman; Jean-François Papillon; Georges Biassou; Jeannot. David Geggus's work on the meeting held on 14 August at the Lenormand de Mézy estate — Makandal's old plantation, thirty-three years on — finds it dominated by coachmen and *commandeurs*, the drivers, the men trusted with authority over other enslaved people.

The men with the whips led the rising.

Module 1 found that this order had manned its floor, at every level, out of people it had beaten and then hired: buccaneers set on buccaneers, free coloured set on the enslaved, maroons freed to hunt maroons, and — at the base of the whole structure — the *commandeur*, an enslaved man given a whip and set over his fellows. That was the cheapest coercive apparatus in the corpus. **And it produced, at the bottom of a society that permitted no other elite among the enslaved, the only men with the standing, the mobility, the literacy, and the trust to coordinate a rising across plantations.** *Elite Chaos* says the crowd is always led by a counter-elite of disappointed insiders. Saint-Domingue had exactly one class of insiders available at that level, and the colony had made it itself.

They rose, as Module 7 established, **in the name of the King** — who had freed them, and whose decree the masters were concealing. A forged royal decree circulated. The rising was framed, by its own leaders, as *enforcement*.

The destruction is given in figures that should be held as ranges: on the order of 180 sugar estates and 900 coffee plantations destroyed; some four thousand whites

killed in the first weeks; and in the September reprisals perhaps fifteen thousand black dead.

A rising against a floor that had cracked, but not yet nearly enough. It did not win. Nothing in 1791 won.

The moment the cost column emptied

The Field Manual asks for the precise moment at which the credible expectation of organised violence against a defector ceased to be credible. It is not 22 August 1791. It is **June 1793**, and it can be dated to a week.

The civil commissioners — Sonthonax, Polverel, Ailhaud — had arrived in September 1792 with some six thousand troops. On 4 April 1792 Paris had granted full civil equality to free men of colour, and the whites had refused it. And in June 1793 the newly arrived governor, Galbaud, quarrelled with Sonthonax and turned the fleet's crews and the white colonists of Cap-Français against him.

Sonthonax, the representative of the French Republic, besieged in the colony's principal city by the colony's own white population and hopelessly outnumbered, **opened the gates to the black insurgents outside** and offered freedom to every man who would fight for the Republic.

Cap-Français burned. Thousands of whites fled to the United States.

That is the moment. Not a rising. Not a revolt. The moment the state, at war with its own settlers, invited the men it existed to hold down to come inside and fight for it.

On **29 August 1793** Sonthonax proclaimed general emancipation in the North; Polverel followed in the West and the South. And on **16 pluviôse an II — 4 February 1794** — the Convention abolished slavery in all the French colonies, by acclamation, having heard Dufay speak and having seated Jean-Baptiste Belley, a former slave, as a deputy of the French Republic.

Now read that sequence exactly as *Elite Chaos* requires, and neither more nor less.

Sonthonax was a genuine abolitionist and his conviction was real, and this study will not be cynical about a man who did the thing. But the **act** was a war measure, taken under siege, to raise soldiers against the white planters, against the British, and against the Spanish. **The elite fractured, and one faction armed the people against the other.** That is Crack One, verbatim, and it is the whole mechanism.

And the metropolitan ratification is the second half of the same mechanism, and *Elite Chaos* names it in Part VIII. An elite facing a credible threat would much prefer to buy it off cheaply — with a promise, a concession, better treatment. But a promise can be revoked, and everyone knows it, so a promise does not defuse the danger. To make the concession credible the elite must surrender something it **cannot easily take back**. Emancipation is precisely such a thing. And a promise, in Saint-Domingue, would have been worth nothing at all — because Module 7 established that a century of the seam had taught the enslaved exactly one thing about paper from across the water, which is that their masters lied about it.

The Convention did not free them from conviction alone. It freed them because they were already in arms, because nothing smaller would buy them, and because nothing revocable would be believed.

That is the weight on the lever, and the weight was real, and the lever was worked in Paris.

Toussaint's army was built with other men's guns

In 1793, France was at war with Spain, and Spain shared an island with the insurgents.

The Spanish crown armed them. Jean-François and Biassou took Spanish commissions, Spanish rank, Spanish arms, Spanish pay. And so did a former coachman and estate steward from the Bréda plantation, a freedman of the 1770s who had leased a small coffee property and the labour to work it, named **Toussaint**.

He was a Spanish officer before he was a French one. He was armed, ranked, supplied, and drilled by a European great power in the middle of a world war — and this study must say so as plainly as it can, because the alternative is a fairy tale. **He was not a slave who miraculously acquired a modern army.** He was one of the most formidable soldiers and politicians of his century, and he was equipped by Madrid.

And in **May 1794**, after the Convention abolished slavery and not before, he changed sides — and took his army with him.

Position logic, in its purest and least sentimental form. He went to the power that had freed his people. Spain had not.

The war of the powers

From 1793 the British invaded, took the Môle Saint-Nicolas and Port-au-Prince, and died. British losses in the Caribbean campaign of these years are put at something between twenty and twenty-five thousand men, the overwhelming majority to disease rather than to battle. In 1798 Maitland evacuated, having negotiated directly with Toussaint — **a slave-born general treating, as a sovereign power, with the British Empire.**

Then, in 1799 and 1800, the **War of the Knives**: Toussaint against André Rigaud, the black leadership of the North against the free coloured leadership of the South. Thousands died. The counter-elite fought itself, exactly as the framework expects a counter-elite to do, and the free coloured lost — which is Module 2's caste line, running to its end.

In 1801 Toussaint invaded Spanish Santo Domingo and abolished slavery there.

The state

And on **8 July 1801** he promulgated a constitution.

Article 3: there can be no slaves on this territory; servitude is abolished for ever; all men are born, live and die free and French. Toussaint is Governor-General **for life**, with the right to name his own successor.

And then the constitution turns to labour, and it must be quoted, because the exact words are the finding:

«La colonie étant essentiellement agricole, ne peut souffrir la moindre interruption dans les travaux de ses cultures. Chaque habitation est une manufacture qui exige une réunion de cultivateurs et ouvriers ; c'est l'asile tranquille d'une active et constante famille, dont le propriétaire du sol ou son représentant est nécessairement le père.»

The colony being essentially agricultural cannot suffer the least interruption in the work of its cultivation. **Each plantation is a manufactory requiring an assembly of cultivators and workers; it is the tranquil asylum of an active and constant family, of which the owner of the soil or his representative is necessarily the father.**

And:

«Tout changement de domicile de la part des cultivateurs entraîne la ruine des cultures. Pour réprimer un vice aussi funeste à la colonie que contraire à l'ordre public, le gouverneur fait tous règlements de police que les circonstances nécessitent…»

Every change of domicile on the part of the cultivators brings about the ruin of the crops. To repress a vice so fatal to the colony and so contrary to public order, the governor shall make all police regulations that circumstances require.

And:

«L'introduction des cultivateurs indispensables au rétablissement et à l'accroissement des cultures aura lieu à Saint-Domingue ; la Constitution charge le gouverneur de prendre les mesures convenables pour encourager et favoriser cette augmentation de bras…»

The introduction of the cultivators indispensable to the re-establishment and increase of cultivation shall take place in Saint-Domingue; the Constitution charges the governor to take suitable measures to encourage and favour this **increase of hands**.

Set that beside what this study has established and hold still for a moment.

The *habitation* survives. Module 2 named it as the settlement's founding legal fiction — the deed that conveyed people with the soil. It is in Toussaint's constitution, by name, as the unit of production.

The cultivator cannot leave it. He is bound to the estate by police regulation, and his departure is a *vice*.

The proprietor is "necessarily the father." The paternalist robe of the *ancien régime*, recited back word for word, four months into the life of the state that abolished slavery.

And the constitution provides for the importation of more hands. Module 6 established the third fork — extraction-as-consumption, in which the producer is himself a purchasable commodity and the order must keep importing the world it destroys. That is written into the founding law of free Saint-Domingue.

And Bonaparte, when he read it, was **impressed**. The French government looked at Toussaint's labour regime, saw a system that had militarised cultivation and bound the worker to the soil without the word slavery, and concluded that it could use it; the Naval Minister said as much to Leclerc. **The First Consul's objection to Toussaint was never the labour regime. It was the epaulette.**

Do not sneer at Toussaint for this, and do not excuse him either. He inherited a single-crop economy, a wrecked and scattered population, a hostile world, and a state that could not survive without revenue — and revenue meant sugar, and sugar meant the *habitation*, and the *habitation* meant men in the fields who did not want to be there. **He chose the only machine on the island.** That is position logic, and it is the framework's most uncomfortable finding, and Module 9's last question is now answered in the coldest terms available: *the rupture did not install plurality. It reloaded the same shape under new names.*

The reconquest

25 March 1802: the Peace of Amiens. Britain and France are at peace. The Atlantic is open. Napoleon's hands are free — and this, not any decision taken in the colony, is what brings the French army.

On 14 June 1802 the Naval Minister Decrès sent Leclerc secret instructions: restore the situation as it stood before 1789, and encourage the resumption of the slave trade.

The expedition — the largest France had ever sent across an ocean — eventually put something in the order of sixty thousand soldiers and sailors into Saint-Domingue, in waves, with Dutch, Polish and German troops among them, and with free coloured officers (Rigaud, Pétion, Villatte) attached expressly to counterbalance Toussaint. It landed in February 1802. Dessalines held Crête-à-Pierrot against it in March. On 26 April Henry Christophe submitted with twelve hundred men. On 6 May Toussaint negotiated his own surrender, his generals keeping their ranks.

On 7 June 1802 he was arrested by treachery and shipped to France, to the Fort de Joux in the Jura, where he died on 7 April 1803.

And then the news came.

The law of 20 May 1802 maintained slavery in the colonies where it had been maintained. The consular *arrêté* of 16 July 1802 **restored slavery in Guadeloupe** — Richepance's work; Delgrès blew himself and his men to pieces at Matouba rather than submit. And on 2 July 1802 an *arrêté* renewed the prohibition on people of colour entering French territory.

Read that last one again. **Napoleon reinstated the *Police des Noirs* of 1777** — the very law that Module 2 identified as the moment the settlement moved its

boundary from a status men could earn to a substance they could not, and that Module 8 identified as the sealing of the colonial counter-elite's only exit. Twenty-five years later, the First Consul closed the same door.

This is what turned the war. Not the creed, and not courage. **Information.** The generals who had submitted to Leclerc now knew, with certainty, what was coming — because it had already happened at Guadeloupe.

The fever, and the sea

Yellow fever destroyed the expeditionary army, and Leclerc's own letters are the record of it. He could not move European troops: *elles crèvent en route* — they die on the road. He was reduced to fighting the war **with black soldiers**, punishing rebels with black troops because his own were dead or dying, and visiting English officers remarked on it with astonishment.

Module 1 named the technique: *co-optation of the hunted into the hunt*. It ran one last time, at the very end, in the army sent to re-enslave them.

And on **7 October 1802**, Leclerc wrote to Bonaparte:

«Voici mon opinion sur ce pays. Il faut détruire tous les nègres des montagnes, hommes et femmes, ne garder que les enfants au-dessous de 12 ans, détruire moitié de ceux de la plaine et ne pas laisser dans la colonie un seul homme de couleur qui ait porté l'épaulette, sans cela jamais la colonie ne sera tranquille.»

Here is my opinion on this country. We must destroy all the negroes of the mountains, men and women, keeping only children under twelve; destroy half of those of the plain; **and not leave in the colony a single man of colour who has worn the epaulette.** Without that the colony will never be quiet.

In mid-October the black and mulatto generals went over to the rebellion *en bloc* — and immediately claimed its leadership. The maroon chiefs who had been fighting all along, Lamour Dérance and Sans-Souci, refused in disgust, calling it opportunism. **The counter-elite captured the crowd's war inside a fortnight, and the record says so plainly.**

Leclerc died of the fever on 2 November 1802. Rochambeau succeeded him and conducted a war of extermination: mass drownings in the roadstead of Cap-Français, in which the numbers are disputed and horrifying at any reading; asphyxiation in ships' holds; and dogs imported from Cuba, of which Rochambeau wrote to a

subordinate that no ration or expense would be allowed for their feeding — *«Vous devez leur donner des nègres à manger»* — you must give them negroes to eat.

Then the structure of the world closed the file.

30 April 1803: Napoleon sold Louisiana. The American project was abandoned. **18 May 1803: war with Britain resumed.** The Royal Navy went back on station.

The sea closed. Module 6 established the arithmetic and it now applies to the army instead of the *atelier*: an order that must import its people dies when the sea closes, and it dies by subtraction, without anybody lifting a hand.

18 November 1803: Vertières. Rochambeau capitulated. **1 January 1804: Gonaïves.** Dessalines proclaimed independence, and gave the country back the name the Taíno had used, which Landscape I established was the only thing the first conquest left behind: **Haiti.**

Of the sixty-odd thousand who sailed, the great majority never came home; the figures are contested and every one of them is appalling.

Napoleon, at Saint Helena, was clear-eyed at last. The Saint-Domingue affair, he said, was the greatest folly of his administration; he should have treated with the black chiefs as with the authorities of a province and left Toussaint as viceroy.

He had understood, too late, that he had not been suppressing a revolt. He had been invading a state.

PART III · READING THE COLLAPSE AGAINST THE FRAMEWORK

Which crack?

All four. In sequence. And that is the finding.

Overbreeding (Crack Four) supplied the engine: France's surplus of educated men with nowhere to rise made the Revolution, and Saint-Domingue's own two

overproduced claimant classes — the *petits blancs* France had exported and the *gens de couleur libres* the plantation manufactured — supplied the colony's first two combatants (Module 8).

Fracture (Crack One) opened the door, twice, deliberately: Governor Peynier armed the free coloured against his own colonists in 1790, and Commissioner Sonthonax armed the enslaved against his own colonists in 1793.

Exhaustion (Crack Two) held it open: France fought Austria, Prussia, Britain, Spain, the Vendée, Lyon, Toulon and herself, and could neither reinforce the colony nor, by 1803, reach it.

Conquest (Crack Three) appears in an inverted form the corpus has not seen before. A rival elite did not conquer the colony. **It armed the colony's subjects.** Toussaint's army was built with Spanish guns, and the British paid others, and the French Republic armed them all in the end.

Saint-Domingue is the only case in this collection where all four cracks opened at once — and it is the only slave colony in history whose enslaved took and held a state. Those two sentences are the same sentence.

The refinement — and the case that almost refutes Elite Chaos

Now state the objection at its full strength, because a thesis this hard is worth nothing unless it can survive its best opponent, and Saint-Domingue is the best opponent *Elite Chaos* has ever faced.

The ruled rose. The ruled won. The ruled founded a state. There is no Robespierre here and no Lenin, no radicalised son of the gentry: a coachman and a *commandeur* defeated the armies of Spain, Britain and Napoleonic France. If the common man is never the proximate agent of structural change, what is he doing in the Palace of Sans-Souci?

Elite Chaos survives it. But only by growing, and the growth is this study's largest contribution.

Look at what actually happened. The floor cracked — in Paris, over money, among men who had never seen a cane field. The elite fractured — at the metropole and in the colony. One faction armed the excluded — Peynier, then Sonthonax, then Spain, then Britain. All of that is the framework's ordinary machinery, running exactly to type.

And then the people who had been armed did not stay the common man.

They took rank. They took commissions, artillery, staffs, fortresses, a treasury, a foreign policy, and finally a constitution. Toussaint was a colonel of Spain, then a general of division of the French Republic, then Governor-General for life with the right to name his successor. Dessalines commanded an army in the field. Christophe would build a citadel and crown himself. **By 1802, Leclerc was not putting down a rising. He was invading a state — and Napoleon admitted precisely that, on Saint Helena, when it no longer mattered.**

Name it: the crack that stayed open.

Every crack in *Elite Chaos* closes, and closes fast. The Bolsheviks seized the apparatus and re-formed an elite within months. The German settlement was rebuilt under Allied guns. The Chartists were absorbed. The gap is always brief, because an elite — the incumbent one or the counter-elite that displaced it — always re-forms and shuts it.

What was unique in Saint-Domingue was duration. The crack stayed open for thirteen years. It stayed open because the European war would not end; because yellow fever destroyed every army sent to close it; and because Napoleon had Europe to conquer and only one set of soldiers with which to do it. **None of those three things was Haitian.**

So the addition to *Elite Chaos* is this, and it should be carried into every study that follows:

> ***The common man is never the proximate agent of the opening. But where the opening is held open — by external war, by disease, by a metropole with a more urgent enemy — for longer than an elite can re-form and shut it, then the people armed in the opening become an elite themselves, and can take and hold a state. The question was never whether the ruled were capable of it. The question is how long the door stays open, and that is decided elsewhere.***

The fuel becomes the fire, if the fire is given long enough to burn.

And Leclerc, watching it happen and unable to stop it, identified the irreversible thing with perfect precision. Not the freedom. Not the revolt. Not the burned plantations. **The epaulette.** The rank. The fact that a man who had been priced in the *Encyclopédie* as a *pièce d'Inde* — sound, well made, not lame, and with all his teeth —

was now a general of division. Leclerc knew that this, and only this, could not be undone, and he proposed to undo it by killing every man who had worn one.

The guardrail, held on both flanks

Do not go Whig. The enslaved did not crack the floor, and this study has two controls that settle it. Makandal in 1758: an intact floor, and he was burned in the square. Ogé in 1790: an intact floor, better organised, with a legally unanswerable claim and the sovereign's own decree in his hand — and he was broken alive on the side of the square reserved for men like him. Same courage. Same island. Same people. **What changed by August 1791 was in Paris**, and what changed by June 1793 was that a French commissioner needed soldiers.

And do not go contemptuous, which is the second failure and the worse one. *Elite Chaos* Part VIII is explicit and it applies here at full weight. The pressure from below was a **genuine causal load**. It raised the standing cost of the settlement — Module 5 priced the blind floor, Module 6 priced the consumption. It widened every crack the elite quarrels opened. And above all **it shaped what the winning faction was obliged to concede.** Sonthonax did not free them out of conviction alone; he freed them because they were in arms, because nothing less would buy them, and because — as Module 7 explained — nothing revocable would have been believed. That is Acemoglu and Robinson's credible commitment in its most violent form: a cornered elite surrendering the one thing it could not take back. **They made the threat credible. That is real causation, and to deny it would be to hold the thesis because it is bold rather than because it is true.**

And credit the achievement without one syllable of qualification. The floor cracked across the whole Caribbean in these same years. The same war, the same fever, the same Revolution, the same decrees reached Guadeloupe, Martinique, Jamaica, Cuba, Louisiana and the Spanish Main. **Nowhere else did the enslaved take and hold a state.** Delgrès blew himself up at Matouba because Guadeloupe's crack was not held open. Haiti's was — and what the Haitians did inside that gap, the discipline, the generalship, the diplomacy, the refusal at Crête-à-Pierrot, the thirteen years of it against three empires, was **theirs**, and no structural account in this collection touches it or wishes to.

The crack was necessary. It was not sufficient.

That is the whole of the finding, and it flatters nobody, and it is meant to.

Menu drift, and the reload

Module 8 classified France's colonial solution as **Divide-and-balance**, with an institutional Prevent and a Co-optation-by-debt. Did the classification hold to the end, or drift?

It did not drift. It shattered — precisely as Module 8 predicted it would, in the one way none of the other Menu families fail. It required a live arbiter; the arbiter fractured; and the balance collapsed not into unity but into civil war, and handed the factions it had spent a century cultivating their guns.

And Module 9's final question — *does the rupture install plurality, or reload the same shape under new names?*

It reloaded. The *habitation*, preserved by name. The cultivator bound to the soil and forbidden to change his domicile. The proprietor "necessarily the father." The importation of hands, written into the constitution. A governor for life with the power to name his heir. Dessalines would go further, and the *corvée* would outlive them both.

The framework's coldest prediction, confirmed in the founding document of the only victorious slave revolution in history — and confirmed not by wickedness but by position, because Toussaint inherited one crop, one machine, and no time.

The filter's verdict

Read the outcome, finally, as the filter's verdict on this specific attempt: **a finding about structural fit under the pressures this order happened to meet — not a moral verdict on the people who ran it, and not proof that the design was doomed from the start.**

Saint-Domingue was the richest colony on earth and the most brittle order in this collection, and those are one fact and not two. It ran on force alone, because its robe was decorative and nobody beneath it believed a word of it. It consumed the people it ruled, because a replacement market existed and severed the feedback loop that restrains every other extractor. It manufactured two counter-elites and sealed both

their exits. And it held itself together on a ratio — fifteen to one — which could enforce anything and adjudicate nothing.

It passed every test its position threw at it for a hundred years. Then it met the one test it had itself made unsurvivable, and it failed inside a decade.

The accounting is Module 11's.

A note on sources. The primary quotations are public-domain and given as the sources reproducing them give them.

Leclerc's letter to Bonaparte of 7 October 1802 is quoted from multiple independent reproductions which agree in wording, including the scholarly literature citing Paul Roussier's archival edition of Leclerc's correspondence; minor variants appear (*ne pas laisser* / *ne laisser*; *12 ans* / *douze ans*) and the text is given in its commonest form. Rochambeau's order concerning the dogs is quoted from a reproduction citing an archival thesis and is flagged; it is at one remove and should be verified. Toussaint's Constitution of 8 July 1801 is quoted from the Digithèque of the University of Perpignan's reproduction of the printed text; the article numbering varies between editions and is therefore not cited, and the passages should be checked against a facsimile before compilation, since they carry the module's conclusion. Napoleon's remark at Saint Helena is quoted from a standard reproduction and is not verified against the *Mémorial*.

Modern scholarship is paraphrased and credited. The composition of the leadership of the August 1791 rising — coachmen and *commandeurs*, the "slave elite" — follows David Geggus. **The Bois Caïman ceremony of August 1791 is deliberately not relied upon.** It is deeply embedded in the historiography and in Haitian national memory; there is no clear contemporary record of it; its date, content and historicity are disputed; and this study's argument does not require it and would not be strengthened by it. Readers should know it is contested and that the dispute is not resolved here.

Contested figures are given as ranges or flagged. The cost of the American war to France (of the order of a billion livres or more) and the share of royal revenue consumed by debt service in the late 1780s (around half) are as the standard accounts give them and vary considerably between authorities. The destruction of 1791 (roughly 180 sugar and 900 coffee plantations; some 4,000 whites killed; perhaps 15,000 blacks killed in the September reprisals) is as reported and should be treated as an order of magnitude. British losses in the Caribbean campaign (20,000–25,000, overwhelmingly to disease) are as reported. The size of the Leclerc expedition is given variously; the figure of around 60,000 soldiers and sailors over the life of the

campaign, with the great majority dying, follows the French literature, and the first wave is variously given at 20,000–25,000. The dead of the *noyades* at Cap-Français are disputed at every level and no figure is asserted. Toussaint's death at the Fort de Joux is dated 7 April 1803, which is the standard date; at least one reference source gives 27 April.

The dates of the metropolitan sequence (Assembly of Notables, February 1787; Estates-General summoned August 1788, met May 1789; National Assembly 17 June 1789; Bastille 14 July 1789; Declaration 26 August 1789; war on Austria 20 April 1792; Republic 21 September 1792; the King's execution 21 January 1793; war with Britain and Spain February–March 1793; the Vendée March 1793; Toulon August 1793; Thermidor July 1794; Brumaire November 1799; Amiens 25 March 1802; Louisiana sold 30 April 1803; war with Britain resumed 18 May 1803) are the standard dates of the record. The colonial sequence (the rising of 22–23 August 1791; the commissioners' arrival September 1792; civil equality 4 April 1792; the burning of Cap-Français and Sonthonax's appeal to the insurgents in June 1793; general emancipation in the North on 29 August 1793; the Convention's abolition on 16 pluviôse an II / 4 February 1794; Toussaint's passage from Spanish to French service in May 1794; the British evacuation of 1798; the War of the Knives 1799–1800; the constitution of 8 July 1801; Decrès's secret instructions of 14 June 1802; the restoration of slavery in Guadeloupe by *arrêté* of 16 July 1802 and the law of 20 May 1802; the *arrêté* of 2 July 1802 barring people of colour from France; Christophe's submission 26 April 1802; Toussaint's surrender 6 May and arrest 7 June 1802; Leclerc's death 2 November 1802; Vertières 18 November 1803; independence 1 January 1804) follows the standard accounts and the specialist literature, and individual dates vary by a day or two between authorities.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*

THE PRESENT INHABITANTS

Module 11 · The Grim Accounting — what the order cost while it stood, and what its ending cost, counted on every side and entered in one ledger; a massacre ordered by a head of state and claimed by him in writing; a silence in the archive that is itself an item in the column; and an ordinance in which the King of France conceded, for a hundred and fifty million francs, the independence of a country whose name he declined to use

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The standing cost

Between 1681 and 1791, somewhere between 790,000 and 900,000 Africans were landed alive in Saint-Domingue. In 1789, fewer than five hundred thousand people were alive there in bondage.

Module 1 stated the difference and Module 6 explained it. It is not emigration. It is the ledger of an order which — for reasons that required no cruelty beyond the ordinary, only a functioning market in replacements — consumed its people faster than they were born, for a century, and re-supplied itself from the sea.

And that figure counts only the ones who arrived. Behind it stand the dead of the marches to the African coast, the dead in the barracoons, and the dead of the Middle Passage, where mortality on the crossing is commonly put at something between a tenth and a fifth of those embarked. Whatever multiplier one applies to Saint-Domingue's share of the trade, the number of people killed to produce this colony's labour force is very substantially larger than the number who ever set foot in it.

And behind *that*, in Landscape I, stand the Taíno: a population estimated at contact anywhere between a hundred thousand and well over a million, reduced to some twenty-six to thirty-two thousand by 1514 and to hundreds by mid-century — with the honest qualification, entered then and repeated here, that descendants survived and that the "extinction" is in part an artefact of colonial classification.

This is the standing cost, and the framework requires a precise statement of what it is. It is not an excess of brutality laid *over* the extraction. Module 6 established that it **was** the extraction. The dying was not a by-product of the sugar. It was the mechanism by which the sugar was made.

What the order actually built

The Field Manual is unambiguous, and it is at this point that most accounts of Saint-Domingue go slack: *credit, at full weight, the real coordination the order performed — the roads, the storehouses, the peace, the defence, the liberty — and count, at equal weight and in the same breath, what it cost.*

So credit it. Saint-Domingue built.

It built hydraulic works on the plain of the Cul-de-Sac and in the Artibonite — canals, aqueducts, diversions — which were serious engineering by the standards of any century and which a modern engineer would respect. It built roads and ports. It built Cap-Français, called the Paris of the Antilles: a theatre, a printing press, a newspaper, botanical gardens, a masonic lodge, and the Cercle des Philadelphes, a genuine scientific society founded in 1784 and corresponding with Europe. It ran a legal system, a postal system, and an administration whose own law was compiled by Moreau de Saint-Méry in six volumes. It coordinated the labour of half a million people with an efficiency no other colony in the Atlantic could match.

And it produced roughly half the sugar consumed in Europe and something like sixty per cent of the world's coffee — and by 1789 those were not luxuries. Sugar and coffee had become the calories and the stimulant of the European working day. **Saint-Domingue fed people.** That is true and it must be said.

Now count it honestly, and here is where this case parts from every other in the corpus.

Rome built roads, and people walked on them. The Vietnamese mandarinate ran flood control and famine relief, and the peasantry it taxed was also the peasantry it kept alive. Buganda's kingship coordinated a society that recognised itself in it. In each case the conqueror's syllogism — *order is necessary, therefore this order was* — is genuinely seductive, and it is seductive because it is *partly true*: the order really did perform life-sustaining coordination that its absence would have removed.

Saint-Domingue performed almost none of that for the people who lived under it. The irrigation watered the cane. The roads carried the cane. The port shipped the cane. The theatre entertained the men who owned the cane. The law defined the people who cut it as *meubles*. Every genuine achievement of this order was an achievement **of the extraction**, not an achievement standing beside it.

And that yields a refinement the corpus should carry: the conqueror's syllogism is strongest where the extraction is a rate, and weakest where it is a consumption. A tributary order *must* keep its producers alive, and therefore must perform some real coordination on their behalf, and therefore has a genuine case to make and a genuine debt to acknowledge. An order on Module 6's third fork — consuming and re-supplying from an external market — is under no such obligation, builds no such case, and constructs nothing that is not infrastructure for the mill.

So the test is simple and it needs no moral argument at all: look at what an order built, and ask whom the building served. In Saint-Domingue, the answer is available in the ledgers, and it is: the mill.

But refuse the sentimental mirror as well, because the framework demands that too. It would be false and lazy to say the colony built nothing. It built the most productive economy on earth. The engineering was real. The Cercle des Philadelphes was real. And Module 6 established that the men who ran it were not monsters but ordinary men optimising against a price list. **Hold both. Net neither off.**

The metabolic-death test

The Field Manual asks the question at collapse: was the coordination the subsistence metabolism, or only governance and commerce? Where it was the metabolism, the collapse toll is catastrophic; where it was only governance, near-bloodless.

And Saint-Domingue returns an answer that forces the test to be restated.

Its coordination *was* the subsistence metabolism of the enslaved — and not because the order cared for them. It was the metabolism because the order had abolished every alternative. It had cleared the land of everything but cane and coffee. It imported the colony's food — salt cod from the New England ports, flour from the American seaboard. It confined the enslaved to *jardins* on the marginal ground and to the rations the estate issued.

So when the plantations burned and the ships stopped coming, **the food went**, and famine did work that no army did. The dead of the war years include people whom nobody shot.

The refinement: the metabolic-death test measures *dependence*, not *benevolence*. An order can be simultaneously the sole source of its subjects' subsistence and the thing consuming them, and when it falls, they starve anyway. The test does not require that the coordination have been benign — only that it have been *sole*. That is a sharpening the corpus needs, because otherwise the test reads as a backhanded compliment to the order it is measuring, and here it is nothing of the kind.

The collapse, counted on every side

Set them all in one ledger. Do not rank them. Do not net them.

1791, the northern rising. Some four thousand whites killed; on the order of 180 sugar estates and 900 coffee plantations destroyed. In the September reprisals, perhaps fifteen thousand black dead. All figures contested.

1790–91, the repression of Ogé. Vincent Ogé and Jean-Baptiste Chavannes broken alive on the wheel on the side of the Place d'Armes appointed for men like them; around forty death sentences in all; others to the galleys for life.

1791–1802, the caste wars and the War of the Knives. Toussaint against Rigaud; thousands dead in a civil war between the black leadership of the North and the free coloured leadership of the South.

The British. Between twenty and twenty-five thousand dead in the Caribbean campaign, overwhelmingly of disease.

The French. Of the order of sixty thousand soldiers and sailors sent; the great majority never returned; about twenty generals dead, Leclerc among them. And in Leclerc's own hand, on 7 October 1802: destroy all the negroes of the mountains, men and women; keep only the children under twelve; destroy half of those of the plain; and leave not a single man of colour who has worn the epaulette.

Rochambeau's war of extermination, 1802–03. The drownings in the roadstead of Cap-Français, disputed at every level and appalling at any reading. Asphyxiation in ships' holds. Dogs imported from Cuba, of which Rochambeau wrote to a subordinate that no ration and no expense would be allowed for their keep — «*Vous devez leur donner des nègres à manger.*» You must give them negroes to eat.

The Haitian dead are the largest number in this ledger and the least well counted. Estimates for the whole revolution run from a hundred thousand upward, and the record is thin, and the thinness is not neutral. We will come to it.

And then, in 1804, the massacre — which must be counted here, in this same ledger, and counted straight.

1804

From February to April 1804, on the orders of Jean-Jacques Dessalines, the remaining French inhabitants of Haiti were systematically killed. It was done town by town; Dessalines travelled the country to see it done and to punish those who had spared. The estimates run from about three thousand to five thousand dead, and they are disputed. Women and children were among them. Polish and German soldiers who had deserted to the Haitian side, along with some priests, some medical men, and certain others, were exempted and given citizenship.

It was not a spasm. It was policy — ordered by a head of state, executed by a state, and claimed afterwards by that head of state in writing.

On 28 April 1804, Dessalines proclaimed:

«Oui, nous avons rendu à ces anthropophages guerre pour guerre, crime pour crime, outrage pour outrage. Oui, j'ai sauvé mon pays, j'ai vengé l'Amérique !»

Yes, we have rendered to these cannibals war for war, crime for crime, outrage for outrage. Yes, I have saved my country; I have avenged America.

And in the same proclamation he gave his reason, and the reason was Guadeloupe: Guadeloupe pillaged and destroyed, its ruins still smoking with the blood of its children, its women and old men put to the sword — and Delgrès, who blew himself up with the fort he was defending rather than accept their irons.

Count it. Do not explain it away. Do not use it to cancel anything, and do not permit anything to cancel it.

The framework's discipline here is not to weigh atrocities against one another and strike a balance, which is a moral accountancy this study rejects. It is to **put them in one ledger and refuse to net them off.** Rochambeau's dogs do not excuse Dessalines's massacre. Dessalines's massacre does not excuse Rochambeau's dogs. A century of the *pièce d'Inde* excuses neither, and neither of them excuses the century.

What the framework *can* say is structural, and it should say it without flinching in either direction. **Dessalines was doing what a new state does when its floor is the only thing it possesses.** He held a country with no robe, no substrate, no recognition, no navy, no allies, and one overwhelming certainty: that France would come back. Module 10 showed his predecessor's constitution reloading the *habitation*. The massacre of 1804 and the constitution of 1805 are the same act at a different level — **an attempt to make the country unusable to the returning master.**

And the constitution of 1805 says so. Article 12: no white man, of whatever nation, shall set foot upon this territory as master or proprietor, nor ever in future acquire any property here. And Article 14: **all Haitians shall henceforth be known only by the generic denomination of blacks.**

Read Article 14 with Module 2 open.

Moreau de Saint-Méry divided every human being into one hundred and twenty-eight parts and built a survey to locate the boundary in the blood. Dessalines abolished the survey — **by making everybody one colour.** The Poles and the Germans who had fought for Haiti were declared black. The category was severed from the body altogether and attached to citizenship.

The line was not abolished. It was inverted. Module 9 asked whether the rupture would install plurality or reload the same shape under new names. Module 10 answered on labour. **This is the answer on caste.**

And hold the honest complication, because *The Architect and the Inheritor* requires it. Article 14 is also, read the other way, among the most radical acts of the age: it made *black* a legal category of **belonging** rather than of exclusion, and it made that belonging available to a Polish soldier. Both readings are true at once. The category was taken from the enemy and turned inside out — and it remained a category. A thing that was built, inherited, and rebuilt is still a built thing, and it was now real in a new way.

The silence in the archive

The Field Manual instructs that where the record is thin, the thinness is itself a symptom and not a measure of the case's importance. Here it is more than a symptom. **It is an item in the cost column, and it has a date.**

Almost nothing survives that was written by an enslaved person of Saint-Domingue. No memoirs. No diaries. No letters. No petitions in their own hand. We know Makandal through the memorandum of the prosecutor who burned him. We know the *Vaudoux* through Moreau de Saint-Méry, who described its king, its queen, its oath and its laws without appeal, and called its congregation *la troupe imbécile*. We know the runaways through the advertisements their owners placed in the *Affiches Américaines*. We know Zabeth and Marie-Rose only because a court wrote down that they had been found in chains with their legs burned.

That silence is not an accident of preservation. It is the direct output of a policy, and the policy has a date: 24 November 1763, when the Conseil supérieur of Cap-Français expelled the Jesuits — in part, as Module 4 established, for instructing the enslaved out of the presence of whites and revealing to them the majesty of man, at the risk of awakening subversive ideas of equality.

The colony decided not to teach them to write. So they did not write. So we cannot hear them.

Enter it in the ledger, and generalise it, because it will recur in every study this collection ever does of an order that withheld formation: *a coloniser who withholds formation destroys not only his subjects' futures but their testimony — and the historian who comes afterwards inherits the silence as a fact of the record and is liable to mistake it for an absence in the world.* The thinness of the archive is the last thing the *Code Noir* did, and it is still doing it.

Then the bill was sent

Haiti was independent on 1 January 1804. And then, for twenty-one years, nothing.

France would not recognise it. The Vatican would not recognise it until 1860. The United States would not recognise it until 1862 — Abraham Lincoln, in the middle of a civil war over slavery.

And here is the coldest position-logic calculation in this entire corpus.

After 1804, reconquest was not worth it, and every chancellery in Europe could see the arithmetic. Production had collapsed. Sugar had migrated — to Cuba, to Brazil, to the British islands, which enjoyed an enormous boom precisely *because* Saint-Domingue had fallen. Dislodging the new leadership and restarting the

economy would cost more than it returned. Even Britain, with every motive and the world's largest navy, did not take it.

So the powers took the only benefit that remained on the table, which was the example.

Isolate it. Refuse it recognition. Cut it out of the markets. And make certain that every enslaved person in Cuba, in Jamaica, in Louisiana, in Brazil, could look across the water and see exactly what an independent black republic amounted to: poor, alone, unrecognised, and paying.

The lesson taught to every other slave colony in the Americas was: even if you win, there is nothing there.

The ordinance

On 17 April 1825, at the Tuileries, Charles X signed.

Look first at the **instrument**, because the framework's discipline is to name the legal fiction as fiction and to read the form before the content. It is an *ordonnance* — a unilateral sovereign act of the King. Not a law, which the Chambers would have had to examine. Not a treaty, which would have required a counterparty. **The government of Haiti does not appear in the document.** It is not a party to it. It is not mentioned.

And the addressee is *«les habitants actuels de la partie française de Saint-Domingue»* — **the present inhabitants of the French part of Saint-Domingue.**

France does not use the word *Haiti*. Twenty-one years after Gonaïves, the King of France addresses a piece of French territory and the people who happen at present to be living on it.

«Voulant pourvoir à ce que réclament l'intérêt du commerce français, les malheurs des anciens colons de Saint-Domingue et l'état précaire des habitants actuels de cette île…» — Wishing to provide for what is demanded by the interest of French commerce, the misfortunes of the former colonists of Saint-Domingue, and the precarious state of the present inhabitants of that island…

Article 1. The ports shall be open to the commerce of all nations, and the duties levied there shall be equal and uniform for every flag — *«excepté le pavillon français en faveur duquel ces droits seront réduits de moitié»* — **except the French flag, in whose favour those duties shall be reduced by half.**

Article 2. The present inhabitants shall pay into the Caisse générale des dépôts et consignations of France, in five equal annual instalments, the first falling due on 31 December 1825, **the sum of one hundred and fifty million francs**, intended to indemnify the former colonists who shall claim an indemnity.

Article 3. *«Nous concédons, à ces conditions, par la présente ordonnance, aux habitants actuels de la partie française de Saint-Domingue, l'indépendance pleine et entière de leur gouvernement.»*

We concede — on these conditions, by the present ordinance, to the present inhabitants of the French part of Saint-Domingue — the full and entire independence of their government.

We concede.

They had taken it. At Crête-à-Pierrot and at Vertières, from Rochambeau, over thirteen years, against three empires. And the King of France wrote that he was **conceding** it, for a hundred and fifty million francs, to some people who happened to be living there.

And the framework has a name for this, and should note that the name runs in both directions. *Elite Chaos* Part IX holds that the dignifying myth exists because a settlement which has widened its circle prefers to tell the newly admitted that they *rose and won* rather than that they were *let in when a frightened elite found it cheaper to deal them in*. Charles X does the exact opposite — and for precisely the same reason. He insists they were *conceded* what they in fact took, because to admit that a slave army had beaten a French one was the one thing no slave-holding power in the Atlantic could afford to have said aloud. **The myth serves the settlement, not the truth, and it will therefore say whichever thing the settlement needs it to say.** Flatter the victor where flattery binds him; deny the victory where denial protects the system elsewhere.

The arithmetic of the sum

And then there is how the figure was reached, and it is the most exact thing in this module.

The table annexed to the law of 30 April 1826 assessed the annual revenues of the colonists' properties in 1789 at 48,822,404 francs for sugar; 70,299,731 for coffee; and 25,542,664 for cotton, indigo and other produce — a total of 144,664,799

francs, plus five million for urban property, rounded to **one hundred and fifty million.**

Read what that means with Module 6 open.

The indemnity was computed from the revenue of the plantations of Saint-Domingue **at their peak**. And Module 6 established precisely what that revenue was: the output of a labour force being consumed faster than it could be born, and resupplied every year from the Atlantic.

The sum Haiti was made to pay was, arithmetically and by the French Treasury's own working, the capitalised value of the people it had freed. France charged the formerly enslaved the market price of themselves.

The enforcement, and the century after

In July 1825 the baron de Mackau anchored off Port-au-Prince with a squadron of fourteen warships carrying upwards of five hundred guns. President Boyer described the demands as excessive and beyond all his calculations. He signed. The Senate ratified on 11 July.

To pay the first instalment, Haiti **borrowed thirty million francs from French banks**, at a discount that delivered far less than the face value. She borrowed from France in order to pay France. This is the *double dette*, and it is the reason the debt outlived everyone who signed it. The first payments were carried to Brest in iron-bound chests and delivered to the Caisse des Dépôts in Paris.

On 12 February 1838, under the pressure of a second squadron, the indemnity was reduced to ninety million, the balance payable over thirty years. Boyer was driven from the country in 1843 by citizens demanding lower taxes. By the later nineteenth century something in the order of eighty per cent of Haiti's revenues was going to foreign debt service, France first among the collectors. The indemnity itself was cleared in the 1880s — the sources give 1878, 1883 and 1888, and the discrepancy is not resolved. **The loans raised to pay it were not cleared until 1947.**

The cumulative cost cannot be stated as a fact and will not be stated as one here. The 2022 *New York Times* investigation, working with economic historians, put the lost growth at somewhere between twenty-one and a hundred and fifteen billion dollars; a 2021 academic study concluded that Haiti's per capita income in 2018 might have been nearly six times higher — comparable to the Dominican Republic

— had the indemnity never been imposed. **These are counterfactuals, and they must be held as counterfactuals.** But the direction and the order of magnitude are not now seriously disputed by anyone working on the question.

Reading the accounting against the framework

First: the conqueror's syllogism is strongest where the extraction is a rate and weakest where it is a consumption. A rate-extractor must keep his producer alive, and therefore builds things that serve him, and therefore has a case. A consumption-extractor builds only the machinery of the consumption. The test requires no moral argument: *look at what the order built, and ask whom the building served.*

Second: the metabolic-death test measures dependence, not benevolence. An order can be the sole source of its subjects' subsistence *and* the thing devouring them, and when it falls, they starve. The catastrophic collapse toll is not a backhanded compliment to the order that produced it.

Third: the silence in the archive is an item in the cost column, not a gap in it. Formation withheld produces a people who cannot write, therefore a history that cannot hear them, and a historian who inherits the policy and may mistake it for a fact about the world. This is the *Code Noir*'s last surviving effect, and it is still operating.

Fourth: the dignifying myth runs in both directions. It flatters the newly admitted where flattery binds them, and it denies the victory where denial protects the settlement elsewhere. Charles X *conceded* what had been taken from him at Vertières, and he did it because the alternative was to say, in a public instrument, that an army of former slaves had beaten France — and no slave-holding power in the Atlantic could permit that sentence to exist.

Fifth, and coldest: the last benefit an abandoned order extracts is the example. When reconquest ceased to pay, the powers took what remained — and what remained was the demonstration. They made Haiti poor deliberately, and they did it so that the ledger could be shown to everyone still in chains.

And the discipline, held to the end. This module has counted a century of consumption, a war of extermination, a massacre of unarmed people ordered by a head of state, and a ransom calculated from the price of the ransomed. It has refused to let any of them cancel any other. That refusal is the whole of what this study means by

the grim accounting: **not a verdict, but a ledger — with every column filled, on every side, and nothing struck off.**

A note on sources. Primary quotations are public-domain and given as sources reproducing them give them.

The *Ordonnance du 17 avril 1825* is quoted (preamble and Articles 1, 2 and 3) from the text as published by the Fondation pour la mémoire de l'esclavage and cross-checked against an independent reproduction; the two agree. The table of valuation annexed to the law of 30 April 1826 (48,822,404 francs for sugar; 70,299,731 for coffee; 25,542,664 for cotton, indigo and other products; plus 5,000,000 for urban property) is reproduced in the French scholarly literature (*Outre-Mers*, 2003) and is given as that literature gives it; a competing account bases the sum on Haiti's 1823 exports rather than on 1789 revenues, and the discrepancy is noted rather than resolved — but both readings converge on the same substantive point, that the figure was derived from the value of the plantation economy. Dessalines's proclamation of 28 April 1804 is quoted from a reproduction and has not been checked against a contemporary printing; it is load-bearing and should be verified before compilation. Articles 12 and 14 of the Haitian Constitution of 1805 are given in substance from standard reproductions and are **not** quoted verbatim here, the wording not having been verified for this module.

Contested figures are given as ranges and flagged. The slave-trade totals are those established in Module 1. Middle Passage mortality (commonly a tenth to a fifth of those embarked) is as the standard literature gives it, and no multiplier is applied to Saint-Domingue's share; the point is made qualitatively rather than with a manufactured number. Taíno figures are as given in Landscape I with the same caveats. The 1791 destruction and casualty figures, the British and French losses, and the Haitian dead are all disputed and are given as reported. **The 1804 massacre is given at three to five thousand dead, which is the commonest range; higher and lower figures exist and the question is genuinely open.** The *noyades* at Cap-Français are not quantified.

The indemnity's history is as the recent scholarship gives it: the squadron of fourteen warships under the baron de Mackau in July 1825; Boyer's signature and the Senate's ratification on 11 July 1825; the thirty-million-franc loan raised in France to pay the first instalment; the reduction to ninety million by the treaty of 12 February 1838; and the servicing of the associated loans until 1947. **The date on which the indemnity itself was finally cleared is given variously as 1878, 1883 and 1888 in reputable sources, and this study does not resolve it.** The estimate that Haiti's

2018 per capita income might have been some six times higher absent the indemnity derives from a 2021 academic study reported in the 2022 *New York Times* investigation; the range of $21bn–$115bn in foregone growth is that investigation's, and both are explicitly counterfactual modelling and are presented as such.

The Cercle des Philadelphes (founded 1784), the theatre and press of Cap-Français, and the hydraulic works of the Cul-de-Sac and the Artibonite are reported from the standard accounts and are not quantified. Recognition dates (the Vatican, 1860; the United States, 1862) are as the standard record gives them.

Part of the collection Patterns of Power. *Tested, never revealed.*

NOTHING TO RENT

Module 12 · Convergence and Divergence — reading French Saint-Domingue against the corpus it completes: the zero point of the substrate axis, where the coloniser found nothing to rent, redirect, seize, or forge; the revisions an order with no substrate forces on the framework; and the strongest case against this whole reading, stated at full strength and answered without flinching

A case study in the Patterns of Power series · Thomas J. Bryan with Claude (Anthropic) · held as tested, not revealed

The axis this case makes visible

Every colonial study in this collection has found the same thing beneath the conquest, and the finding has become so familiar that it has almost stopped being a finding: **the coloniser never meets an innocent baseline.** He arrives on top of a former conquest that has already reached the self-running pole, and his entire cheapness depends on what he can do with it.

Set the four completed colonial cases in a row and an axis appears which no single study could see.

French Vietnam. A substrate with a deep apex *and* a deep base — the Confucian village, the lineage hall, the mandarinate, the calendar. France **rented** it whole: it formed the people for free, administered them for free, and lent its legitimacy at interest. That is why the colony could be thin, and cheap, and why its finding was that the coloniser "pays, in the end, the full price of the belief it never bought."

British Buganda. A substrate with a strong and legible apex — a kingdom. Britain **redirected** it, preserving the *kabakaship* and ruling through it, and the study's verdict was that the gentleness was not the opposite of the taking but the most refined technique of it.

French Algeria. A substrate with a contested apex — the beylik, the *ulama*, the *marabouts*. France **seized** what it could and fought the rest, and the study's verdict was the door that Rome had opened and France kept shut.

British Kenya. A substrate with a base but **no apex at all** — the Kikuyu order had reached the self-running pole *acephalously*. Britain could not redirect a hierarchy that did not exist, so it **forged** one: catechists and appointees made into chiefs, and the Emergency's civil war ran along the line between the state's fabricated authorities and the people they had been set over.

And now **French Saint-Domingue**, which has **no substrate at all**.

Landscape I established why, and the reason is the recursion failing rather than the recursion being absent. The prior conquest on this island did not naturalise. **It exterminated.** The Taíno were destroyed, and the Spanish crown then depopulated the western third by force in the Devastations of Osorio, and what France found in the 1660s was not a naturalised former order but a **vacancy** — with feral cattle in it, and armed men living off them, and one surviving word, *boucanier*, taken from a dead people's name for a grill.

A vacancy cannot be rented.

So the axis runs: **rent it (Vietnam) — redirect it (Buganda) — seize it (Algeria) — forge it (Kenya) — and, at the zero point, have none, forbid one, and build the whole floor yourself, for ever (Saint-Domingue).** The next study in this series, on Senegal, is expected to add a sixth position — a coloniser who inadvertently *helps build* a substrate, in the Sufi brotherhoods — and if it does, the axis will be complete.

That is this study's place in the corpus. It is the zero point, and the zero point is what makes the axis an axis.

And everything extreme about Saint-Domingue follows from that one fact, mechanically, without any further assumption:

Because there was no belief doing any work, **the floor had to do all of it** — and so it was devolved to every proprietor, one whip to a gang, the most savage and most distributed coercive apparatus in the collection (Module 1).

Because the ruled would never believe anything, **the robe was never cut for them** — and so it became decorative, a comfort for men three thousand miles away, and it survived the publication of its own complete refutation in the *Encyclopédie* without a tremor (Module 3).

Because forming them would have meant admitting them, and because there was no substrate to form them *instead*, **formation was not withheld but prohibited** — and the priests who gave it were put on a ship in 1763 (Module 4).

Because there was no substrate, **the ruled built one** — Vodou, Kreyòl, the maroon bands, the *commandeur* class — and the coloniser could see it, describe it, and ban it, but could never *rent* it (Module 4).

And because a market in replacements existed, **the extraction ceased to be a rate and became a consumption** (Module 6).

The divergences, stated exactly

Against Vietnam, on formation. The Vietnam study found formation *decapitated* — the base kept, the ladder cut — and found it affordable "because the substrate formed the people for free." **Saint-Domingue is that sentence with the second clause deleted.** It cut the ladder, kept no base, and had nothing forming anyone. The consequence is the sharpest single divergence in the corpus: **where a coloniser withholds formation and there is a substrate, the substrate holds the field; where he prohibits formation and there is no substrate, the ruled build their own — and what they build is invisible to him as an institution, and therefore unrentable.** Moreau de Saint-Méry walked into a Vaudoux assembly, wrote down its king, its queen, its oath and its *lois sans appel*, and filed the whole thing under superstition. A French administrator could look at a Vietnamese village council and see a government. He could not look at a *hounfour* and see one, because his own robe forbade the recognition.

Against Vietnam, on extraction. Vietnam's finding was that rate extraction "farms the appetite it taxes and preserves the governed in order to bleed them." **Saint-Domingue's is the exact inversion, and it is the third fork.** Where the producer is himself purchasable, his death is not a loss but a purchase order, and the feedback loop that generates every "just enough" equilibrium in this collection is severed — not by cruelty, but by a functioning market. **A rate colony preserves in order to bleed. A consumption colony bleeds and re-supplies.**

Against Algeria, on the seam. Algeria gave the corpus the seam split by a sea. Saint-Domingue accepts that and adds the failure mode: **a seam does not break when the truth gets out; it breaks when a lie gets in.** A century of withholding taught the enslaved exactly one reliable thing about the world across the water — that their masters lied about it — and so, in 1791, a *forged* royal decree did the work that forty years of Jaucourt and Raynal and Grégoire could not (Modules 3, 7).

Against Algeria and Kenya, on the liberty variable. Vietnam found that "in a colony, the liberty variable is a border and not a dial." Saint-Domingue sharpens it: **a border is a jurisdiction, and a jurisdiction can be crossed.** The counterweight the free coloured needed *existed* — it was in Paris, in a press no censor could hold and a legislature that debated in the open. So they did not petition; **they travelled.** And what Ogé brought home was not a doctrine but a **warrant** — and an unenforced warrant is the most dangerous document a foreclosed order can receive, because it converts rebellion into *enforcement*, which is the only kind of violence that does not have to argue for itself (Module 9).

Against Kenya, on the collapse. Kenya gave the corpus the floor-victorious refinement: the rebellion crushed, the order falling anyway. Algeria gave the cost column that empties being the *metropole's*: France won the military war and lost the political one.

Saint-Domingue is the only case in this collection where the floor was beaten in the field. Vertières. Rochambeau capitulated. And the framework's answer to that — the study's largest single contribution — is that **by 1803 it was not a rebellion. It was a state**, with generals, artillery, fortresses, a treasury, a constitution and a foreign policy, and Napoleon admitted precisely that at Saint Helena when he said he should have left Toussaint as viceroy of a province.

The crack stayed open long enough for the fuel to become the fire. And Leclerc, watching it happen, named the irreversible thing with total precision: not the freedom, not the revolt, but **the epaulette.**

The revisions this case forces

Gathered from the modules, these are Saint-Domingue's contributions to the framework, and they are stated here as the corpus should carry them.

The recursion has two branches, and a vacancy cannot be rented. The corpus has always said the coloniser meets a naturalised former conquest. It must now add that a former conquest can also have *exterminated* rather than naturalised, leaving nothing behind — and that this, not indigenous weakness, is what forces the coloniser to build the entire floor himself, permanently, at the expensive pole, for ever (Landscape I).

A floor can be bought rather than fought. Where the subject population is *purchased* rather than conquered, the founding violence is offshored, performed by parties the coloniser can disown, and entered in his books as a cost of goods — and the floor becomes **recurrent** rather than founding, because the people it buys die (Module 1).

Co-optation of the hunted into the hunt — a new Menu variant. Buccaneers set on buccaneers; free coloured set on the enslaved; maroons freed on condition of hunting maroons; and, at the very end, black troops used by Leclerc to fight black troops because his own died of fever. Nearly free, and it manufactures, over three generations, exactly the armed counter-elite that *Elite Chaos* requires (Modules 1, 10).

The moving marker. Where a settlement's boundary is acquirable and enough of the excluded acquire it, the settlement does not open — it relocates the boundary onto something unacquirable, and then builds a science to survey the new boundary, because the new boundary is invisible. Moreau's one hundred and twenty-eight parts are a **cadastral survey of blood** (Module 2).

The decorative robe, with its test. Where the ruled are held by force alone and the beneficiaries are at a distance, the robe's function collapses from *legitimation* into *comfort* — and the diagnostic is available: publish its refutation and see whether anything moves. If nothing moves, it was decorative, and it will be dropped the instant it costs anything (Module 3).

Formation prohibited, not merely withheld — and the reason stated in court. Algeria withheld formation. Saint-Domingue expelled the Jesuits for giving it, on the reasoned ground that instruction would awaken subversive ideas of equality, and that legitimate marriage would remove from the master *la faculté de diviser les esclaves* (Module 4).

Maximum extraction destroys formation-suppression. Two dials the framework treated as independent are geared together: an order that consumes its people faster than they are born cannot creolise them, and must keep importing in bulk the world it is trying to erase. Two-thirds of the enslaved were still African-born at the end (Module 4).

A substrate can be borrowed only by a coloniser whose doctrine permits him to recognise it as an order (Module 4).

The blind floor. An order that installs no belief installs no *channel*, and therefore cannot know what its subjects are doing. Surveillance is the tell of a belief that never

took; **divination is the tell of a floor with no surveillance worth the name** — and a floor reduced to torture as an instrument of inquiry *manufactures the conspiracies it fears* (Module 5).

Where the cost column carries the entire load, the law cannot restrain the cost column. The *Code Noir*'s protective articles were not ignored through wickedness; they were **structurally unenforceable**, because in an order running on terror alone any limit on terror is correctly read as a threat to the whole. Le Jeune said so himself (Module 5).

The third fork: extraction-as-consumption. The producer neither preserved nor removed but consumed and re-supplied. No equilibrium, no endpoint, only a throughput — and a diagnostic available in any archive that counts: **an order whose output rises while its subject population falls is on this fork and no other** (Module 6).

The seam's failure mode is forgery, not exposure (Module 7).

No colonial administration can censor its own metropole. The seam is held by the metropole's *silence*; when the metropole becomes a public argument, the filter is void, because what would have to be suppressed is the law (Module 7).

The default of fear. An apex bound by a threat rather than a code: perfectly reliable, wholly non-adjudicative. It survives every external pressure and cannot survive its first serious internal question (Module 8).

Divide-and-balance, run as a full case, with its failure mode named. The Field Manual flagged this family as unrun. It is now run. And it is **the only Menu family that requires a live arbiter** — and therefore the only one that does not corrode slowly but fails in an afternoon, into civil war, worse than an undivided order would, because it has spent a century manufacturing the factions that will fight (Module 8).

Export relocates the pressure; it does not discharge it. The terminus of an export chain accumulates every claimant the chain ever moved, and has nowhere to send them on (Module 8).

A core that cannot enforce concedes in language. Barnave's silence when Grégoire asked him a direct question is the whole mechanism (Module 9).

An excluded class turns the creed back to the exact width of its own exclusion — and cannot hold it there. Ogé excluded the enslaved from his claim in writing. He was a proprietor with a racial grievance, not a slave with a human one. And a

universal creed, once admitted to bind the order at all, cannot be admitted only partway, **because the limit is not in the creed's gift** (Module 9).

The crack that stayed open — and it is the largest revision this study makes:

> ***The common man is never the proximate agent of the opening. But where the opening is held open — by external war, by disease, by a metropole with a more urgent enemy — for longer than an elite can reform and shut it, then the people armed in the opening become an elite themselves, and can take and hold a state. The question was never whether the ruled were capable of it. The question is how long the door stays open, and that is decided elsewhere*** *(Module 10).*

The conqueror's syllogism is strongest where the extraction is a rate and weakest where it is a consumption. Look at what an order built, and ask whom the building served (Module 11).

The metabolic-death test measures dependence, not benevolence (Module 11).

The silence in the archive is an item in the cost column, not a gap in it. Formation withheld produces a people who cannot write, therefore a history that cannot hear them, and a historian who inherits the policy and may mistake it for a fact about the world (Module 11).

And the dignifying myth runs in both directions. It flatters the newly admitted where flattery binds them; and it *denies the victory* where denial protects the settlement elsewhere. Charles X *conceded*, in a public instrument, an independence that had been taken from him at Vertières — because no slave-holding power in the Atlantic could permit the other sentence to exist (Module 11).

What holds

Against all of that, the spine holds, and honesty requires saying so plainly.

French Saint-Domingue is a colonial variant of the framework, not a counterexample to it — and it is the variant that proves the framework was never a claim about capacity.

The convergence with Vietnam and Buganda and Algeria and Kenya is position logic at scale, and no hidden hand is required (*No Hidden Hand*). The object throughout is the three monopolies — and Saint-Domingue's anomaly, that they

were *not* fused in one coalition but split across an ocean and leased to a middle caste, is precisely what detonated it (*The Three Monopolies*). The order reproduced by default, each proprietor defending the whole by defending his own position, and needing no cabal to do it (*By Default*). The extraction went past the bone, because both dials were at the stop *and* a replacement market existed (*Just Enough*). Surveillance was the tell of a belief that never took, and this order took it one stage further into divination (*The Machine That Runs Itself*). The colour line was cynical in its construction and sincere in its inheritance, and both are true (*The Architect and the Inheritor*). And the surprises lived, exactly as the framework insists, one level up — in Peynier arming the free coloured, in Sonthonax opening the gates of Cap-Français, in a bankrupt monarchy summoning an Estates-General it could not control.

And its short life makes it a control case for the filter, and the purest one in the collection. Algeria's hundred and thirty-two years caught the engine before formation could compound it. Saint-Domingue's hundred-odd years caught the engine **before formation had even been attempted** — and it therefore isolates a variable Algeria could not. Algeria withheld formation from the conquered and got a **counter-nation**. Saint-Domingue prohibited formation and had no substrate to fall back on, and got a **counter-substrate**: a religion, a language, and a class of drivers who would lead the rising. The pair together say something the corpus could not say from either alone. **Formation withheld does not produce a blank. It produces whatever the ruled can build in the dark — and the coloniser will not be able to see it, and therefore will not be able to use it, and will discover what it was on the night it burns his mills.**

The strongest case against this reading

Now state it at full strength, because a study that will not do this has not earned its conclusions.

First, and hardest, the consequentialist prong — and it is not a moral objection but an arithmetical one. Saint-Domingue produced roughly half the sugar consumed in Europe and around sixty per cent of the world's coffee, and by 1789 those were not aristocratic luxuries. They were the calories and the stimulant of the European working day, the cheap energy of the labour force that built the

industrial world. The colony financed Bordeaux, Nantes and Le Havre; it underwrote the material civilisation in which the *Encyclopédie* was printed and the salons met and the philosophy this study quotes was written. And the revolution destroyed it: by 1800 production stood at about a fifth of its 1789 level, and Haiti today is among the poorest countries in the Americas while the Dominican Republic, on the same island, is not. **On any consequentialist accounting, the destruction of Saint-Domingue destroyed vast real value and left its own people demonstrably worse off than their neighbours.** If an order is to be judged by what it produced and by what replaced it, this order produced more than its successor, and its successor produced misery.

Second, the methodological prong. The reading offered here is unfalsifiable. Every failed rising is explained by an intact floor; the one successful rising is explained by a crack that stayed open. That is not a theory but a ratchet, and it is a ratchet that happens to strip the enslaved of the only victory they ever won.

Third, the equivalence prong. The study puts the massacre of 1804 in the same ledger as the *pièce d'Inde*. These are not commensurable — one was a century of systematic commercial killing for profit, the other a three-month act of a cornered state facing re-enslavement. To place them in one column is a false equivalence dressed as rigour.

Fourth, the agency prong. *Elite Chaos* calls the common man "fuel," "the weight one broken faction swings." Toussaint Louverture negotiated with three empires, wrote a constitution, and defeated the finest army in Europe. Dessalines founded a state. To call these men fuel is not analysis. It is contempt with a bibliography.

The answer, without flinching

To the fourth, first, because it is the one this corpus has now conceded three times and should concede again without reluctance.

The framework does not say the ruled are incapable. **It says they cannot open the door.** And Saint-Domingue is the clearest proof anywhere of that distinction, because it shows exactly what they did *once the door was open*: they became officers, then generals, then a government; they wrote a constitution; they treated with Spain, with Britain, and with France; and they beat Napoleon's army in the field. **The claim**

was always about the door and never about the ceiling. Toussaint was not fuel. He was fuel that became fire, and the framework's most exact praise of him is precisely this — that of every enslaved leader in the history of the Americas, he was the one standing in the gap when the gap held.

To the second, on falsifiability. It is falsifiable, and it has been tested, and this island is the test bench. The theory predicts that a rising against an intact floor loses. Makandal, 1758: burned. The Bahoruco maroons: bought off in 1785 with their own freedom, on condition they hunt other maroons. Ogé, 1790: better organised than either, holding a decree of the sovereign that made his cause legally unanswerable — **broken alive on the wheel**, on the side of the square appointed for men like him. Three risings. Same island, same people, same century, same courage. All against an intact floor. All crushed.

And the theory predicts that the ruled can win **where the crack is held open long enough by forces they do not control** — and that prediction is testable against a control group that history supplied. The same world war, the same yellow fever, the same French Revolution, the same decrees of abolition reached Guadeloupe, Martinique, Jamaica, Cuba, Louisiana and the Spanish Main. **Nowhere else did the enslaved take and hold a state.** Guadeloupe's crack closed inside a season: Richepance landed, slavery was restored, and Delgrès blew himself and his men to pieces at Matouba rather than go back into irons. **Same courage. Same creed. Same enemy. Different door.**

The thesis would be refuted by a single rising that beat an intact, unified, well-supplied floor. There is not one in the record.

To the third, on the 1804 massacre — and the objection improves the study, so concede what is true in it. The two are *not* morally equivalent, and this study has never claimed they were. **What the ledger does is refuse to net them off, which is a different operation entirely.** To place two costs in one ledger is not to say they weigh the same; it is to say that both were paid, that both must be counted, and that **neither may be used to erase the other.** Rochambeau's dogs do not excuse Dessalines. Dessalines does not excuse Rochambeau. The century excuses nothing and is excused by nothing. That is not equivalence. It is refusing to let anybody's arithmetic close.

And to the first — the consequentialist prong, which is the real one, and which must be answered hardest.

Concede the facts entirely. Yes: half of Europe's sugar. Yes: the ports of Bordeaux and Nantes. Yes: the material world of the Enlightenment ran, in part, on this colony's produce. Yes: production collapsed. Yes: Haiti is poor and Santo Domingo is not.

Now do the arithmetic, and decline to round the sum.

The wealth *was* the consumption. Module 6 is not a moral gloss laid over the economics; it *is* the economics. Between 790,000 and 900,000 people were landed. Fewer than five hundred thousand were alive when the trade stopped. The colony's output rose, without interruption, across the same century in which its people fell. **You cannot enter the sugar in the credit column and leave the difference out of the debit column, because they are the same transaction.** The hogsheads and the dead are not two facts to be weighed against one another. They are one fact, seen from the two sides of a ledger, and the exchange rate between them is computable and nobody who makes this argument ever computes it.

And the counterfactual is not "no sugar." It is *sugar produced by people who were not consumed* — which is exactly what the world went on to do, at a somewhat higher price. The comparison is not between the *Encyclopédie*'s coffee and no coffee at all. **It is between coffee at one price and coffee at another.** The defenders of this order are asking the reader to accept that the difference between those two prices was worth the difference between those two mortality rates — and they are asking it without ever naming the rate. **Name it, and the argument dies where it stands.**

And Haiti's poverty is not the revolution's verdict upon itself. Module 11 laid out the mechanism, and it is not a matter of interpretation. One hundred and fifty million francs, calculated by the French Treasury from the capitalised revenue of the 1789 plantations — which is to say, **from the value of the people who had freed themselves.** Extracted under the guns of fourteen warships. Paid with money borrowed from French banks, so that Haiti borrowed from France in order to pay France. Serviced until **1947**. Twenty-one years of non-recognition before that, and a century of deliberate isolation afterwards, imposed for a reason the powers did not trouble to hide: **so that every enslaved person in the Americas could look across the water and see precisely what victory was worth.**

They did not merely fail to help Haiti. **They made an example of it, on purpose.** To point now at the resulting poverty as evidence against the revolution is to hand the arsonist the insurance claim.

And now the honest residue, which must be conceded or the study becomes propaganda.

Not all of Haiti's poverty is the indemnity's doing, and this study will not do to Haiti what it refuses to do to France, which is to turn it into an object with no agency. **Toussaint chose the *habitation*** — the bound cultivator, the proprietor "necessarily the father," the constitutional provision for importing more hands (Module 10). **Dessalines chose Article 14**, which did not abolish the caste line but inverted it (Module 11). **Boyer signed.** The *corvée* outlived them all. Those were choices, made from a narrow menu — and the menu was narrowed by others, and the narrowing was deliberate and is the largest single item in the account — but they were choices, made by men, and men who make choices own them.

State the arithmetic. Decline to round the sum. Let the reader do the addition.

The double truth

The only victorious slave revolution in the history of the world was won by men who could not have won without a European war they did not start, a fever they did not summon, and a metropole that had a more urgent enemy elsewhere.

And the fact that they needed all three takes nothing whatever from the fact that they — alone out of every enslaved population in the Americas, alone in the whole record of human bondage — were the ones standing in the gap when the gap held, and walked through it, and did not come back out.

The crack was necessary. **It was not sufficient.** And the whole dignity of the thing lives in the space between those two words.

A note on sources. This module quotes no primary text and introduces no new evidence. Every factual claim in it is established, sourced, and flagged in the module from which it is drawn, and the reader is referred there: the Taíno and the Devastations of Osorio to Landscape I; the *pièce d'Inde* and the *maréchaussée* to Module 1; the one hundred and twenty-eight parts and the *Police des Noirs* to Module 2; Montesquieu, Jaucourt and the decree of 8 March 1790 to Module 3; the Jesuit expulsion of 24 November 1763 and the *Vaudoux* to Module 4; Makandal, Courtin's memorandum and the Le Jeune affair to Module 5; the demographic collapse and the third fork to Module

6; Raynal's condemnation and the forged decree of 1791 to Module 7; the Assembly of Saint-Marc and the *Léopardins* to Module 8; Ogé's letter and the sentence of the Conseil supérieur to Module 9; Leclerc's letter of 7 October 1802 and Toussaint's constitution of 8 July 1801 to Module 10; and the ordinance of 17 April 1825 and the massacre of 1804 to Module 11. The provenance flags entered in those modules stand, and several of them — the *Encyclopédie* folio, Moreau's *lois sans appel*, the Jesuits' charge sheet, Le Jeune's own words, Ogé's exclusion of the enslaved, and Dessalines's proclamation — must be cleared before this study is compiled.

The comparisons are to the completed studies in this collection (French Vietnam, British Buganda, French Algeria, British Kenya) and to the framework papers named in the text (*The Machine That Runs Itself*, *The Architect and the Inheritor*, *Above Warlordism*, *Elite Chaos*, *No Hidden Hand*, *The Three Monopolies*, *By Default*, *Just Enough*, *The Hand at the Hinge*), and are drawn from those documents rather than from any external authority. The projected position of Senegal on the substrate axis is a **prediction**, entered here as a prediction and not as a finding, and the Senegal study will confirm or refute it.

The strongest case against this reading is stated in this module in its own strongest form, and the reader should know that the consequentialist prong in particular has serious and reputable defenders in the economic literature on the Atlantic system, and that the counterfactual estimates on both sides of the Haitian indemnity question — those cited in Module 11 and those that would resist them — remain contested and are modelling rather than measurement.